

**THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957**

**HEARINGS**  
BEFORE THE  
**COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS**  
**UNITED STATES SENATE**  
EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION  
ON  
**H. R. 12138**  
AN ACT MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR  
THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1957, AND  
FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations



Document No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Review of this document by CIA has  
determined that

- ☒ CIA has no objection to declass  
☐ It contains information of CIA  
interest that must remain  
classified at T S S  
Authority: HR 70-2

☐ It contains nothing of CIA interest

Date 14-5-81 Reviewer

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

STAT  
STATEMENTS OF ALLEN W. DULLES, DIRECTOR; L. K. WHITE, DEPUTY DIRECTOR; NORMAN S. PAUL, LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL; [REDACTED] CHIEF, BUILDING PLANNING STAFF, AND E. R. SAUNDERS, COMPTROLLER, CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY; F. S. POORMAN, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, AND CHARLES PALMER, CHIEF ESTIMATOR, PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE, GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION; MAX ABRAMOVITZ, MICHAEL RAPUANO, AND T. J. CRAPSTER, ARCHITECTS

JUSTIFICATION

Chairman HAYDEN. Next we have the Central Intelligence Agency and the justification will be inserted in the record at this point. (The justification referred to follows:)

"CONSTRUCTION

"For the preparation of detail plans and specifications and the construction of a Central Intelligence Agency headquarters installation and for other purposes as authorized by title IV of the Act of July 15, 1955 [(Public Law 161)] (69 Stat. 349) to remain available until expended, [\$5,500,000] \$49,000,000."

CONSTRUCTION, CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Program and financing

	1955 actual	1956 estimate	1957 estimate
Program by activities:			
1. Design, specifications, and supervision.....		\$1,785,000	\$184,000
2. Construction.....		23,000	42,320,000
3. Roads.....			6,774,410
Total obligations.....		1,808,000	49,278,410
Financing:			
Unobligated balance carried forward.....		3,692,000	3,413,590
Unobligated balance brought forward.....			-3,692,000
Appropriation.....		5,500,000	49,000,000

## Obligations by objects

Object classification	1955 actual	1956 estimate	1957 estimate
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY			
10 Lands and structures.....		\$8,000	
ALLOCATION TO GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION			
02 Travel.....		500	\$4,000
06 Printing and reproduction.....			40,000
07 Other contractual services.....		1,784,500	180,000
10 Lands and structures.....		15,000	42,280,000
Total, General Services Administration.....		1,800,000	42,504,000
ALLOCATION TO DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR			
Total number of permanent positions.....			10
Average number of all employees.....			9.5
Number of employees at end of year.....			10
Average salaries and grades:			
General schedule grades:			
Average salary.....			\$6,223
Average grade.....			GS-10.0
01 Personal services (permanent positions).....			\$59,00
02 Travel.....			800
04 Communication services.....			400
05 Rents and utilities.....			2,000
06 Printing and reproduction.....			3,000
07 Other contractual services.....			27,230
08 Supplies and materials.....			1,000
09 Equipment.....			300
10 Land and structures.....			6,277,000
15 Taxes and assessments.....			100
Total, Department of the Interior.....			6,370,830
ALLOCATION TO DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
Total number of permanent positions.....			46
Average number of all employees.....			43.7
Number of employees at end of year.....			46
Average salaries and grades:			
General schedule grades:			
Average salary.....			\$5,401
Average grade.....			GS-8.7
01 Personal services (permanent positions).....			\$240,000
02 Travel.....			3,000
04 Communication services.....			1,600
05 Rents and utilities.....			9,000
06 Printing and reproduction.....			12,000
07 Other contractual services.....			132,580
08 Supplies and materials.....			4,000
09 Equipment.....			1,000
15 Taxes and assessments.....			400
Total, Department of Commerce.....			403,580
Total obligations.....		1,808,000	49,278,410

*Detail of personal services*

	1955 actual	1956 estimate	1957 estimate	
			Num- ber	Total salary
ALLOCATION TO DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
Field:				
General schedule grades:				
GS-12. Range \$7,570 to \$8,645:				
Landscape architect.....			2	\$15,140
Architect.....			2	15,140
GS-11. Range \$6,390 to \$7,465:				
Landscape architect.....			2	12,780
Architect.....			1	6,390
GS-9. Range \$5,440 to \$6,250:				
Landscape architect.....			1	5,440
GS-5. Range \$3,670 to \$4,480:			2	7,340
Total permanent, field.....			10	62,290
Deduct lapses.....			.5	3,230
01. Personal services, Department of Interior.....			9.5	59,000
ALLOCATION TO DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE				
Field:				
General schedule grades:				
GS-13. Range \$8,990 to \$10,065:				
Bridge engineer.....			1	8,990
Engineer.....			1	8,990
GS-12. Range \$7,570 to \$8,645:				
Bridge engineer.....			3	22,710
Engineer.....			1	7,570
Supervisory engineer.....			1	7,570
GS-11. Range \$6,390 to \$7,465:				
Bridge engineer.....			2	12,780
Engineer.....			2	12,780
Supervisory engineer.....			1	6,390
GS-9. Range \$5,440 to \$6,250:				
Bridge engineer.....			2	10,880
Engineer.....			17	92,480
Administrative assistant.....			1	5,440
GS-7. Range \$4,625 to \$5,335:			6	27,150
GS-6. Range \$3,670 to \$4,480:			6	22,020
GS-4. Range \$3,415 to \$3,840:			2	6,830
Total, permanent, field.....			46	232,680
Deduct lapses.....			2.3	12,580
01. Personal services, Department of Commerce.....			43.7	240,000

JUSTIFICATION FOR SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A BUILDING  
 FOR THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

*Prior developments*

For several years the Central Intelligence Agency, in cooperation with the General Services Administration, has been seeking to provide a central headquarters building to accommodate its personnel presently housed in 34 buildings, widely scattered throughout the city of Washington. More than a year ago, based upon the determination that there was no existing permanent structure adequate or suitable to agency needs, authorization was requested to construct a permanent office building in or near the District of Columbia to house Agency personnel stationed in the Washington area.

The Congress recognized the Agency's need for a headquarters building by authorizing (69 Stat. 349) \$46 million for its construction (together with \$8.5 million for the extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from its present terminus at Spout Run to a point near Langley in Fairfax County, Va., if the Agency finally selected the Bureau of Public Roads property as the building site).

The Congress initially appropriated (69 Stat. 453) \$5.5 million, with the understanding, as communicated to the Agency, that \$3 million of this sum was for the preparation of detailed plans and specifications for the headquarters installation, and \$2.5 million for acquiring right-of-way and initiating construction of the parkway.

At the time this appropriation was considered, the Congress expressed a wish that the Agency restudy carefully the site location of such a building. To meet this request the Agency engaged Clarke and Rapuano, a firm of consulting engineers and landscape architects of outstanding reputation in this field, to survey all the available sites and recommend the one best suited for the Agency's purpose. Their study resulted in a strong recommendation of a portion of the property presently occupied by the Bureau of Public Roads at Langley, Va. The Agency approved this recommendation and, as required by law, proposed it for consideration by the National Capital Planning Commission.

The National Capital Regional Planning Council and the National Capital Planning Commission approved this recommendation on December 5, 1955, and February 3, 1956, respectively. Accordingly, the Agency is proceeding in coordination with the General Services Administration to take all steps necessary to construct a building at the Langley site as rapidly as possible. In coordination with the Public Buildings Service, an architect-engineer contract has been negotiated with the firm of Harrison & Abramovitz. The architects have prepared schematic and diagrammatic drawings of the proposed headquarters installation together with supporting architectural and engineering information, and the Public Buildings Service has prepared the cost analysis and estimate on which this supplemental request is based. We have, therefore, completed the preliminary planning and are ready now to enter the definitive portion of the project.

The congressional authorization of \$46 million was less than the \$50,840,000 originally estimated by the Public Buildings Service to be the sum necessary to construct an office building of sufficient size to accommodate the headquarters of the Agency. Since the previous estimate was prepared by the Public Buildings Service, March 28, 1955, the Engineering News Record building cost index has increased by 5.72 percent, and the trend continues upward. Current estimates prepared by the Public Buildings Service, with the concurrence of Harrison & Abramovitz, indicate that it would be impossible to construct a suitable office building of adequate size to accommodate the entire headquarters within the present authorization. These current estimates indicate that \$55,980,000 would be required for relatively austere construction and site development. Under the present authorization, a reduction from original plans of 300,000 square feet of net useable space would be required in the building. However, the building proposed will provide space for all of our employees who are now housed in temporary buildings, thus permitting the evacuation of that space so that its demolition will be possible in accordance with Government plans for urban renewal in the District of Columbia, and as required by the Act authorizing the building. The total number of buildings occupied by the Agency will be considerably reduced, with resultant benefits. Delay, in addition to perpetuating excessive operating costs, may occasion an appreciable further increase in construction costs, thereby further reducing the space that can be provided with the funds available.

In considering the nature of the installation, a complete survey was made with the architect-engineer of the special requirements of the Central Intelligence Agency. The unusual security needs of this Agency make mandatory a compartmentation of personnel greatly in excess of that normally required in Government or private office buildings. Special arrangements must be made for secure handling in storage and transmission of large amounts of classified material. Provision must be made for the installation and effective use of special electronic equipment used in the analysis of intelligence data. Finally, the Agency desires a building which, while without frills, will provide a working atmosphere for its employees which will be pleasant and conducive to maximum production. Considering all of these factors, as well as the physical characteristics of the site, the firm of Harrison & Abramovitz has recommended a building consisting of block-type wings as most satisfactorily meeting all the special and unusual requirements of the Agency.

#### *Security factors in the new building*

Located on a 125-acre tract forming an inconspicuous part of a larger 750-acre Government reservation, the Langley site was chosen as the one location, among many sites inspected in detail, most adequate for safeguarding the security of CIA's operations and for conducting these operations with the greatest measure of economy and efficiency consistent with security consideration. This site, with its isolation, topography, and heavy forestation, permits both economical construction and an added measure of security safeguards. It is efficiently located with respect to overcoming rush-hour traffic conditions, and it

permits rapid access to the White House, the National Security Council, and the State and Defense Departments, with which the bulk of CIA day-to-day coordination activities are concerned.

The general arrangement and layout of the office space in the new building have been designed with security considerations primarily in mind. The new building will consist of block-type wings, readily compartmented from one another, so that specially restricted areas can be established and special security controls maintained in each section, with a degree of flexibility not otherwise practicable. In this building pattern, certain types of services common to the entire Agency will also be housed in separately enclosed sections, but near the center of the building, conveniently available to all points in the building. Still other activities will be set aside in special controlled areas for receiving applicants, trainees, contacts, and other categories of visitors.

The proposed construction will permit a number of special facilities to be installed, protected, and maintained in separate sections of the building. Many of these special facilities will be simply reinstalled from their present scattered locations into the new building; others will represent special communication, storage, and protective devices that will be built into the building in the course of construction.

#### *Economy and efficiency factors in the new building*

While security considerations have dominated the general design and technical details of the new building, there are also many economies that will result from housing the Agency in a single, efficiently planned installation. The estimated savings outlined last year to the Congress by CIA have been recomputed in recent days, in the light of the experience of the past 12 months, and have been found again to be as valid as before, with slight variations up or down on particular items. The present high cost of guard forces, reception staffs, shuttle-bus operation and use, and interbuilding couriers will be substantially reduced. Teletype and telephone mileage charges, building service officers, rents, alteration, and moving costs are other elements of expense that will be drastically reduced or eliminated altogether. Time lost in shuttling between buildings will be eliminated with a saving of over \$600,000 annually, aside from the saving in bus operation and maintenance. There will be increased efficiency in the processing of intelligence information not readily measurable in monetary terms.

In addition, the generally austere architectural design of the proposed building assures a further measure of savings which would not be possible if the new building were located in the heart of the Nation's Capital, where there are special artistic demands for expensive, monumental-type public buildings with ornamental embellishments. The long experience and outstanding reputation of the firm of Harrison & Abramovitz in the design of large office buildings provide an assurance of good design and sound construction.

#### *Obligations*

The estimated obligations during fiscal year 1956 have been substantially decreased from the amounts shown in budget document, due to the delays incident to the selection of a site.

#### *Urgency*

Since last July, when the Congress authorized a new headquarters building for CIA, the progress toward the realization of a secure and economical building has been steady and continuous, in virtually all aspects of the necessarily complicated preliminary planning required.

We cannot proceed much further, however, unless additional funds are available for obligation. Not until the building is completed can the Agency vacate temporary structures, which would permit their demolition. Even while the architect is completing detailed plans, we can proceed with necessary preliminary activity—if the funds are available. This will be a construction project of considerable magnitude. Provisions must be made for adequate access to the site; for parking facilities for the several thousand construction workers who will be involved; for preparation of the site to allow the construction of foundations and to provide stockpile areas for construction materials. Additional right-of-way must be acquired for the extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and its extension must be commenced so that it will provide access to the site. The net result of taking these steps would be to bring that much closer the day when the building will finally be ready for occupancy. In view of all the security advantages and the savings in money, manpower, and oper-

ating efficiency resulting from completion of this project, every day lost in breaking ground and proceeding with construction is a costly one.

The urgency that funds be immediately available for obligation cannot be overemphasized.

It is therefore requested that the Congress appropriate \$49 million, constituting the balance of the funds presently authorized, in order that the construction may proceed without interruption.

HEADQUARTERS BUILDING, CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY, LANGLEY, VA.

*New building, \$46 million*

Building: Consisting of block-type wings and cafeteria; 2 wings, basement, ground, and 5 stories; other wings, ground, and 5 stories; cafeteria, ground, and 1 story; auditorium, 1 story. All wings to have mechanical penthouses as required. Construction, reinforced concrete and spread footings; exterior, face brick and concrete, stone trim at main entrance only; projected steel sash with DSA glass, no screens. Ceilings, generally, suspended acoustic plaster; fixed partitions for corridors, concrete masonry units; finish, plaster on masonry units and painted masonry units; air conditioning, all weather; lighting, surface mounted fluorescent fixtures; asphalt tile floor generally; movable partitions, wire stud with gypsum lath and plaster. Laboratory areas include no furniture and equipment.

Total cross areas, exclusive of boiler plant (square feet)-----	1,845,000
Volume: Approximately (cubic feet)-----	24,200,000
Net area:	<i>Square feet</i>
Agency space-----	1,185,000
Cafeteria-----	55,000
Custodial, etc-----	45,000
Total-----	1,235,000

*Estimate*

Building construction, including air conditioning-----	\$34,405,000
Elevators-----	1,500,000
Subtotal-----	35,905,000
Boiler and air conditioning plant-----	1,800,000
Mechanical distribution-----	200,000
Outside utilities, water tank, and fire lines-----	255,000
Special requirements-----	1,285,000
Emergency generator-----	500,000
Roads, parking, and site development-----	1,635,000
Reservations-----	228,000
Contingencies-----	1,692,000
General expenses:	
Drawings and specifications-----	2,040,000
Supervision-----	360,000
Office expense-----	100,000
Subtotal-----	2,500,000
Total estimated cost-----	46,000,000

*Special requirements*

Robertson floor system, in part-----	\$150,000
Pneumatic tube-----	350,000
Nitrate film storage-----	35,000
ADT system-----	200,000
Auditorium-----	150,000
Laboratory space-----	200,000
Radio and microwave antennas-----	50,000
3 incinerators and chute (security)-----	105,000
Private elevator-----	45,000
Total-----	1,285,000

## SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957 725

*Estimated cost of the extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from its present terminus to the site of the CIA Bldg. near Langley, Va.*

<b>Grading (2- to 40-foot roadways) :</b>	
Spout Run to Chain Bridge (2.7 miles)-----	\$1, 230, 500
Chain Bridge to Langley (3.3 miles)-----	1, 528, 000
Total grading-----	<u>2, 758, 500</u>
<b>Structures :</b>	
Spout Run Bridge, high level-----	402, 300
Spout Run Bridge, low level-----	86, 300
Windy Run Bridge-----	546, 000
Donaldson Run Bridge-----	574, 700
Gulf Branch Bridge-----	517, 200
Glebe Road Overpass-----	459, 800
Pimmit Run Bridge-----	510, 400
Virginia Route 123 underpass-----	459, 800
Langley grade separation-----	363, 200
Total structures-----	<u>3, 919, 700</u>
<b>Paving (2- to 24-foot reinforced concrete roadways) :</b>	
Spout Run to Chain Bridge (2.7 miles)-----	594, 800
Chain Bridge to Langley (3.3 miles)-----	727, 000
Total paving-----	<u>1, 321, 800</u>
Total construction-----	8, 000, 000
Land acquisition and miscellaneous-----	500, 000
Total-----	<u>8, 500, 000</u>

## PREPARED STATEMENT

Chairman HAYDEN. Mr. Dulles, I notice you have a prepared statement, and I was wondering whether it is necessary for you to read all of it, or perhaps you can highlight it?

Mr. DULLES. I will try to do that, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HAYDEN. It will be included in full in the record.

Mr. DULLES. I will try to cut it down to about 10 minutes in length.

## CIA HEADQUARTERS BUILDING

The Congress, in title IV of the Military Construction Act of 1935 (69 Stat. 349), authorized \$46 million for the construction of a CIA headquarters building, together with \$8,500,000 for the extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from its present terminus at Spout Run to a point near Langley in Fairfax County, Va., if the Agency finally selected a portion of the Government-owned Bureau of Public Roads property as the building site.

The Congress initially appropriated, chapter III of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 453), \$5,500,000, with the understanding that \$3 million of this sum was for the preparation of detailed plans and specifications for the headquarters installation, and \$2,500,000 for acquiring right-of-way and initiating construction of the parkway.

I am here today to request the appropriation of the balance of the authorized funds, \$49 million, of which \$43 million is for the building and \$6 million for the extension of the Parkway.



SITE OF BUILDING

When the Congress suggested last year that we study carefully the location of our proposed headquarters building, we engaged Clarke & Rapuano, a firm of consulting engineers and landscape architects of outstanding reputation in this field, to survey all the available sites and recommend the one best suited for the Agency's purpose.

They looked over some 30 possible sites.

Their study resulted in a strong recommendation of a portion of the federally owned property presently occupied by the Bureau of Public Roads at Langley, Va.

Located on a 125-acre tract, part of a larger 750-acre Government reservation, the Langley site was chosen as the one location, among many sites inspected in detail, most adequate for safeguarding the security of CIA's operations and for conducting those operations with the greatest measure of economy and efficiency consistent with security considerations.

This site is bordered along the Potomac by Parkway land, a belt 750 to 1,000 feet wide, under the control of the National Park Service, affording an added measure of protection.

The isolation, topography, and heavy forestation of the site provide additional security safeguards. It is efficiently located with respect to overcoming rush-hour traffic conditions, and it permits easy access to the White House, the National Security Council, and the State and Defense Departments, with which the bulk of CIA day-to-day coordination activities are concerned.

APPROVAL OF LANGLEY, VA., SITE

The Agency approved the recommendation of Clark and Rapuano and, as required by law, proposed it for consideration by the National Capital Planning Commission.

The National Capital Regional Planning Council (May 3) and the National Capital Planning Commission (July 5) approved the Langley site on December 5, 1955, and February 3, 1956, respectively.

Senator CHAVEZ. Mr. Dulles?

Mr. DULLES. Yes, sir.

Senator CHAVEZ. Those agencies that you now suggest as approving it, they do not have anything to do with the appropriation of the money to carry on the program?

Mr. DULLES. None at all, sir. It is quite understood and their opinion, as I understand, since we propose to be outside the District, is advisory.

In addition, the Fairfax County Planning Commission, the Arlington and Fairfax County Boards and the Falls Church City Council have all endorsed this location.

REPORTS

With your permission, I shall submit for the record the reports of the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Capital Regional Planning Council and the Fairfax County Planning Commission, a brief of the primary factors contained in the Clarke and Rapuano report, and a statement as to the status of land acquisition.

Chairman HAYDEN. That may be done.  
(The information referred to follows:)

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION,  
Washington D. C., March 2, 1956.

Mr. ALLEN W. DULLES,  
Central Intelligence Agency,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DULLES: As indicated in my letter of February 6 and pursuant to your request, the National Capital Planning Commission reviewed further your proposal to establish a new headquarters for the Central Intelligence Agency at Langley, Va., and approved this proposal.

In its new findings the Commission has accorded overriding importance to the emphasis placed upon your statements contained in your letter of January 23, 1956, that you are not free to select a location within the District and that by virtue of emergency measures already taken it is important for you to locate on the west side of the Potomac River and that you desire that the location be at Langley.

The Commission has approved the enclosed final report prepared by a committee of the Commission. The committee has set forth in this report the obstacles which it feels must be overcome by the Federal and local governments to solve problems connected with this site.

Sincerely yours,

HARLAND BARTHOLOMEW, *Chairman.*

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

MARCH 2, 1956.

FINAL REPORT ON THE PROPOSAL TO LOCATE THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
HEADQUARTERS BUILDING AT LANGLEY, VA.

At the request of the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Capital Planning Commission at its meeting on February 3, 1956, reconsidered the action taken at its December meeting on the proposal to establish a new headquarters for the Agency at Langley, Va., and voted to approve the location considered by the Agency to be the most suitable site for its purposes.

The undersigned committee was appointed by the chairman to draft and submit the final report on this proposal, as required by the National Capital Planning Act of 1952. Membership of the committee includes those who have been for and against the Langley site.

As the Commission had been very evenly divided in both its initial opposition and subsequent approval of the Langley location, the committee has chosen to present the differing points of view on the basic planning issues involved.

CONCERN OF COMMISSION AND COUNCIL IN DECISION

Under the Planning Act of 1952, the Planning Commission and Regional Planning Council have collaborative responsibility to prepare and maintain a comprehensive plan for the development of the National Capital and its environs. As the central planning agency for the Federal and District Governments, the Commission has the prime duty of reviewing Federal agency development programs in order to advise as to their consistency with the comprehensive plan.

It is now widely recognized that the most important single factor influencing the development and supporting the general economy of the Washington region has been the growth and spread of Federal establishments. Consequently, the Commission's 1950 comprehensive plan laid great emphasis on the size and location of Government agencies. In order to produce an orderly and uniform expansion of the region, new Federal establishments which could be appropriately located outside the central area were to be distributed on the periphery of existing development or beyond, at such locations as to encourage local development that would be harmonious with other requirements of the plan. Except in Bethesda and Suitland, where commitments had already been made, no single installation larger than 5,000 employees was recommended. Furthermore, new installations were located at least 5 miles from each other or from other large established agencies.

The comprehensive plan, while serving as a general guide and directive for decisions on Federal establishments, also sets forth a general philosophy on

land use and population distribution throughout the area. These basic policies provide the foundation or reason for a regional thoroughfare plan and policies for the provision of community facilities, such as water supply and sewage disposal. The development of such plans is the joint and collaborative responsibility of the National Capital Planning Commission and the Regional Planning Council under the provisions of the 1952 Planning Act.

#### IMPACT ON THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The Commission's proposals for the location of future Federal establishments in the environs of Washington did not contemplate a large Federal establishment in the Langley area. On the contrary, its plan for the location of Federal employees limited the number of those ultimately necessary to complete the Public Roads Research Laboratory development, then estimated in round figures not to exceed 1,000. The principal reasons for this were that the location lay within an area traditionally developed and developing with small estates and single-family homes of low density, which it was generally agreed as desirable to encourage and protect. Furthermore, there was already located or committed in the northwest sector outside of downtown Washington a disproportionately large distribution of Federal employment, tending in the long run to encourage an unbalanced and intensive growth in that direction.

To offset this tendency, the comprehensive plan proposed in the Virginia sector generally west and southwest of the center, 4 locations for Federal establishments of approximately 5,000 employees each. These would have the effect of stimulating intensive suburban growth of a satellite character in localities where there is already established a nucleus for an urban environment and to public facilities already projected or needed.

Whereas the location of 10,000 employees, more or less, at Langley does not accord with the 1950 plan, a majority of the Commission believe that a revision of the plan to accommodate CIA can be appropriately made. The minority does not agree to this revision and believes that a location in Virginia west or southwest of the center of Washington would promote growth of territory better adapted for intensive stimulation.

The position of the majority of the Commission is that there will be no adverse long-range effect of the CIA installation upon the established land use of the surrounding territory. They believe that in the immediate future employees will continue to live very much where they now live and that traffic to and from the installation can be handled over bridges, highways, and parkways already planned though not necessarily programed.

However, there is general agreement by both the Commission and the Regional Council that improvements proposed in the Commission's report of December 16 will need to be programed at an earlier date to accommodate the traffic volumes generated by the installation.

The other point of view, represented by the minority, is that there will be a very profound effect upon the surrounding community with an installation of this size. The reasoning is that inevitably there will be created a demand for more intensive development of tributary territory than has heretofore been contemplated. The fact that only about one-eighth of the employees of CIA own their own homes lends support to the viewpoint of the minority that a marked change in land use for the Langley area is inevitable. The ensuing economic pressure upon land will make it increasingly difficult, if not impossible, for the Fairfax County authorities to maintain the same land-use policies through zoning and subdivision control that have heretofore been envisioned as most appropriate and desirable for this area. This feeling is very strong among many property owners in the Langley area, is widely supported by professional planners, and, perhaps most significantly, by the current waves of land speculation. In this connection, the minority draws attention to the change that has taken place in Arlington County since the construction of the Pentagon. In 1940 nearly three-fourths of the dwelling units in the county were of the single-family type. Today, more than half of all units are apartments, which have increased eightfold against only a doubling of the single-family type.

The Langley site meets the general requirement, set forth in the Commission's April resolution, that it be in close proximity to the outer circumferential. In this respect, the location conforms with the Commission's proposed regional thoroughfare plan, now generally accepted by the highway authorities. However, the priority for construction of major features of that plan will have to be advanced, as herein discussed, if it is proved that the traffic circulation facilities which the installation will require are inadequate.

#### COMMUNITY FACILITIES

The Regional Planning Council, in approving the Langley location last December, voted also to request that the Central Intelligence Agency request appropriations for certain improvements which it considered would be needed at the time the CIA headquarters is opened at Langley. The purpose of this action was, of course, to implement planning recommendations to which the local or State authorities were not financially committed.

It would seem that the first step toward putting into effect the Council's recommendation would be the development and agreement upon a program setting forth the specific community facilities required, and the estimates of cost and methods of financing. The latter is particularly important because of the different jurisdictions involved and the necessity for coordination in the programming of improvements. Following is a list and brief discussion of the important improvements which the studies of the Commission and the Council during the last year have revealed as being necessary to program definitely if the Langley site were chosen.

##### *George Washington Memorial Parkway*

The construction of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from Spout Run to Langley is universally accepted as having top priority. The Clarke-Rapuno report also recommended that the parkway be extended to the Cabin John Bridge along with useful segments of the outer loop, in which recommendation this committee concurs.

While the legislation authorizing the use of the Langley location anticipated the construction of the parkway to Langley and provided for the allocation of necessary funds, the land acquisition program cannot be completed without additional contributions from Virginia to match Federal funds already available or to be made available for this purpose. Surveys and appraisals are required before precise costs can be ascertained. In all probability, several hundred thousand dollars will be needed from State and county authorities.

##### *Other recommended projects*

The Regional Planning Council has recommended the following improvements be financed at Federal expense concurrent with construction by the Agency unless State or local financing is or can be secured:

(a) *Route 123.*—The widening to four lanes of Route 123 from Langley corners to Chain Bridge (\$1,100,000). The State of Virginia has agreed to widen that portion of Route 123 from Langley Corners to the parkway (\$350,000).

(b) *Glebe Road.*—The widening of Glebe Road to four lanes from Lee Highway to Chain Bridge, estimated to cost \$1,300,000.

(c) *Chain Bridge widening.*—The District Highway Department has estimated the widening of this structure to a capacity of 4 lanes to cost \$1,350,000. The studies by Clarke and Rapuno and others indicate the need of additional capacity at an early date, especially if present CIA employees are to be encouraged to maintain their present residences. Otherwise, additional traffic will be brought into and out of the central district over central area bridges, especially Key Bridge.

(d) *Canal Road and Weaver Place.*—Required in connection with the widening of Chain Bridge will be improvements to approach roads on the District side, estimated at a cost of \$900,000.

(e) *Cabin John Bridge and segment of outer circumferential.*—While the Cabin John Bridge and the adjoining segments of the outer circumferential have been endorsed by the Highway Departments of Maryland and Virginia and the Bureau of Public Roads, no program for their financing and construction has been agreed upon. Without this facility, transportation to and from the Langley site will be inadequate, causing serious congestion on existing highways. If the CIA desires to locate at Langley, based in part upon the proximity to the outer loop, the Agency should take the initiative in advancing the priority of this important improvement by endorsing Federal aid to this end.

(f) *Water supply and sewage disposal problems.*—So far as the Agency is concerned, it would seem to have solved its own immediate water and sewage problems through commitments already made by Federal and local authorities. Left unsolved, however, are services to any areas that may develop ahead of scheduled improvements due to the CIA installation.

(g) *Reservations for park and recreational needs.*—Regardless of any stimulus to local development from CIA, it has been estimated that based on present

standards and ultimate development of this section of Fairfax County at low density that at least four times the present park and recreational area will be required to meet future needs. Should the growth of the area be accelerated, as some anticipate, a program for financing advance acquisition of suitable open lands according to the plan should be initiated by the county authorities.

#### RECOMMENDED PLANNING CONTROLS

All those who have favored the Langley site have expressed great confidence in the ability of the county authorities, in cooperation with the interested agencies of the Federal Government, to control the character and extent of development which may either be required or which will take place as the result of the CIA installation. A clear understanding of mutual responsibilities should be formally established. To this end, it is suggested that the Central Intelligence Agency enter into a form of agreement or memorandum of understanding as to the policies of mutual concern that will be followed and financial responsibilities undertaken.

More than a year ago consultants for the Fairfax County Planning Commission completed a comprehensive plan for the county, including a land-use plan, setting up standards generally designed to maintain the single-family, low density, open type of development for the Langley and adjoining areas. This plan has not yet been adopted. It becomes imperative, therefore, in the interest of CIA as well as that of the homeowners in the area who have become concerned about the effects of the installation, that the CIA impress upon the county authorities its desire and expectation of maintaining the low density character of the Langley area through immediate adoption of the county's comprehensive land-use plan.

#### CONCLUSIONS

The committee has endeavored to point up the planning problems connected with the development of the Langley site as a location for CIA headquarters, in the hope that their inclusion in this report will serve a useful purpose in effecting their ultimate solution.

The majority of the committee in arriving at its recommendations has accorded overriding importance to the emphasis placed upon the statements contained in Mr. Dulles' letter of January 23, 1956, that he is not free to select a location within the District and that by virtue of emergency measures already taken it is important to him to locate on the west side of the Potomac River.

L. L. HUNTER,  
C. MCKIM NORTON,  
CLAUDE W. OWEN,  
DAVID H. TULLEY,  
JOHN A. REMON, *Chairman*.

#### CHECKLIST OF REFERENCE DATA RELATING TO CIA HEADQUARTERS LOCATION

##### *National Capital Planning Commission report*

Resolution dated April 8, 1955 (general criteria).  
Committee report, April 7, 1955.  
Joint Commission-Council report on alternate sites.  
Committee report, December 16, 1955.

##### *National Capital Regional Planning Council*

Staff summary report, March 11, 1955.  
Staff report, March 31, 1955.  
Committee report, April 7, 1955.  
Staff report and recommendation, December 5, 1955.  
Member statements approving Langley.

##### *Fairfax County*

Resolutions inviting CIA to county.

##### *Central Intelligence Agency*

Report of Clarke and Rapuano, October 25, 1955.

##### *Other consultant reports*

Consultant, Draper report.  
Consultant, Upham report.

*Miscellaneous reports, documents, and letters*

Committee of 100.  
Virginia Department of Highways.  
Alexandria Chamber of Commerce.  
Fairfax Chamber of Commerce.  
Washington Board of Trade.  
Citizen organizations.  
Letters from many interested citizens.

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY FACILITIES NEEDED IN THE VICINITY  
OF LANGLEY, VA., IN RELATION TO THE NEW HEADQUARTERS BUILDING FOR  
THE CIA

The Regional Council directed this committee to carefully analyze all of the community facilities that have been proposed to service the headquarters building for the Central Intelligence Agency in the vicinity of Langley, Va., and submit requirements with estimated cost as well as the jurisdiction which should be responsible for their programming. This report will have the purpose of alerting the responsible Federal, State, and local governmental agencies as to their part in programming this project on a coordinated basis.

The committee after reviewing the problem was of the opinion that the report should be in three parts. The first having to do with highway and bridge needs which are the primary facilities to be programmed and represent a large portion of the costs. The second part has to do with the need for a special program during the construction period to be sure that present traffic needs can be served with minimum disruption. The third part will be to reiterate, in line with the stated desires of the county and Agency, those phases of the local planning process which must be accomplished to insure the orderly development of the Langley area according to plan.

I. HIGHWAYS AND BRIDGES

The following projects are recommended by the committee as needs that should be provided concurrent with construction of the headquarters building.

A map has been prepared (plate 1) to facilitate your study of this report. The recommended projects are shown on the map with the corresponding numbers.

(1) Route 123 (Virginia) from Langley corner (Route 193) to the George Washington Memorial Parkway. This highway is to be widened from the existing narrow, 2-lane road to a 4-lane divided highway. This highway at the present time is the only route giving access to the Langley property and will in the future be an integral part of the approach network both north and south, carrying commercial as well as passenger vehicles.

This project is estimated at \$350,000 and is committed by the Virginia Department of Highways to be constructed concurrently with the parkway.

(2) Route 123 (Virginia) from the parkway to Chain Bridge. This is a continuation of project (1) upgrading this facility from a 2-lane road to a 4-lane divided highway serving as the approach road from the Chain Bridge crossing to the site. The Regional Council in its action approving this report recommended that both projects (1) and (2) be considered as a single unit functionally in relation to the approach network. This project is estimated to cost \$750,000 and is presently uncommitted. It is recommended that this project be assumed along with (1) by the State of Virginia.

(3) Glebe Road (Route 120, Virginia) from Lee Highway to Chain Bridge. This is an important facility giving access to Route 123 and Chain Bridge from a heavily populated section of northern Arlington County. This highway is presently a narrow winding 2-lane road and is proposed to be widened to a 4-lane divided highway including acquisition of new rights-of-way to provide for better alignment. This project is estimated to cost \$2,200,000 and is not committed at this time. The committee recommends that the State of Virginia be responsible for the programming of this project.

(4) Chain Bridge widened to four lanes. This project is essential to provide required capacity to serve improved approach roads. This project is estimated to cost \$1,350,000 and is not presently committed.

(5) Canal Road and Weaver Place improvements (District of Columbia). This improvement is essential to provide additional capacity to serve the Chain

Bridge, Glebe Road, and Route 123 improvements. This project is estimated to cost \$900,000 and is not committed.

(6) George Washington Memorial Parkway from Spout Run to the Langely site (Virginia). This improvement completes the parkway as an access road continuously from the central area bridges to the site. This project is estimated to cost \$8,500,000. The Congress has committed construction funds for this project concurrent with the approval of the Langely site for the headquarters building. The State of Virginia and Fairfax County are responsible for one-half (25 percent from each) of the cost of land acquisition. The National Capital Planning Commission is responsible for the remaining one-half of the cost of land acquisition in behalf of the Federal Government. The acquisition funds are currently available through the Federal, State, and local agencies. Some adjustment may be required in line with current land costs.

(7) George Washington Memorial Parkway from the Langely site north to the Cabin John Bridge and circumferential highway (Virginia). This project gives high standard access north and east from Virginia and Maryland populated areas. The cost of this project is estimated at \$2,250,000 and is not committed at this time. The committee recommends that the Federal Government be responsible for the construction and one-half of the cost of land acquisition (National Capital Planning Commission) with the State of Virginia and Fairfax County jointly being responsible for the remaining one-half of the cost for land acquisition. Current status of land acquisition funds indicate that preliminary action is being taken to provide for the Federal one-half of the land acquisition moneys.

(8) Cabin John Bridge and approaches. This facility is essential in the approach network from the north relating to the circumferential in Virginia and Maryland and the parkway south. This project is estimated to cost \$7,100,000 and is uncommitted at this time. The committee recommends that the appropriate Federal agency be responsible, in particular as a part of the Interstate Highway System on the proposed 90-10 matching formula now before the Congress. The States would be responsible for their share.

(9) Circumferential highway from Route 7 to Cabin John Bridge (Virginia). This facility would provide distribution on the Virginia side providing a more balanced flow of traffic to the access points such as the Langely and central areas. This project is estimated at \$4,100,000 and is uncommitted at this time. The committee recommends that it be constructed as a part of the Interstate Highway System dependent for programming in the highway legislation now before Congress. On this basis it would be eligible for construction under the 90-10 financing formula with the State paying its share. The committee also suggests that this project be set up as phase I with the section of the circumferential from Jones Point to Shirley Highway as phase II. That section from Route 7 to Route U. S. 50 as phase III and from U. S. 50 to Shirley Highway as phase IV. No cost estimates were available for phase II, III, and IV.

(10) Circumferential highway from Cabin John Bridge to U. S. 240 (Maryland). This improvement would serve as a distributor on the Maryland site serving the northwest section with access to the Langely site as well as the central area. This improvement is estimated to cost \$4,331,000 and is presently committed in the early portion of the Maryland 12-year program. The committee recommends that it be constructed as a part of the Interstate Highway System eligible for 90-10 financing under the legislation now before the Congress. The State would be responsible for its share. The committee also recommends that the balance of the circumferential be constructed in accordance with the interstate highway program because of its importance as a distributor route on the Maryland side.

The committee also recommends that the appropriate State and county authorities study traffic requirements related to certain other facilities in Virginia such as Route 123, Route 193, Route 309, Route 693, Ball's Hill Road, Mackneal Road, Great Falls Road, and any others in order that needed improvements be fitted into their program.

The committee hesitated at this time to assign priorities to all the needed highway and bridge facilities since there are a number that must be constructed concurrently with the headquarters building. However, after discussion of the overall needs, the committee agreed that the Cabin John Bridge should be given highest priority in the uncommitted improvements.

## II. SPECIAL PROGRAM DURING CONSTRUCTION PERIOD

The committee is of the opinion that it is important for the Agency to work out with the appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies a coordinated plan to handle the construction program to allow minimum disruption of existing daily traffic in the vicinity of Langley. It is conceivable that the widening of Route 123, the construction of the parkway and the construction of the building will be going on simultaneously. Unless this is programmed in advance the one-thousand-six-hundred-plus automobiles per lane in the morning and evening peaks now using Route 123, Glebe Road and Chain Bridge will be seriously disrupted. Also the construction traffic generated with slow-moving trucks hauling materials will add to this problem.

## III. ADDITIONAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Since the Agency and the county both emphasized during the consideration of this matter the importance of maintaining the present character of this area as nearly as possible, the committee respectfully emphasizes the prime importance of adopting a comprehensive plan as a key element to the programming of this project. This action will strengthen the zoning and subdivision controls necessary in implementing the plan.

This step will establish the basis for determining present and future requirements for the following important community facilities.

(a) *Water supply.*—The committee in reviewing the present source of supply finds that there should be an adequate supply of water through the Falls Church system by the time the building is ready for occupancy. At the present time, Falls Church is purchasing water, by contract, from Arlington County which is serviced by the line across Chain Bridge. This contract stipulates that should Arlington County find it necessary to terminate the agreement they must give Falls Church sufficient time to supplement their source of supply. The city of Falls Church by agreement with the Corps of Engineers dated December 1, 1954, has deposited funds for the construction of a 36-inch main in the new Little Falls Dam now being constructed. The city of Falls Church still has to provide funds for a connection to the Dalecarlia plant on the District of Columbia side and a line from the dam to their system on the Virginia side. The Falls Church Water Department stated on October 1955, by letter, that funds required to complete this system are in their capital budget with construction presently scheduled to be started in fiscal 1958 and completed by 1960. However, the letter states that should the system be required sooner their plans are elastic enough to permit completion at an earlier date.

(b) *Sewage treatment.*—The committee agreed that the present commitments by the county should provide adequate facilities for the headquarters building. These commitments are in the form of a letter to the agency stating that the county will provide a line immediately available to the property with no cost to be borne by the Federal Government. The committee suggests that care be exercised in order to meet the standards established by the Corps of Engineers and the Interstate Commission of the Potomac River Basin relating to river pollution.

(c) *Park and recreation needs.*—The committee emphasizes the importance of planning and acquiring the needed sites prior to the development of the area, while land values are reasonable.

(d) *School site.*—Here again the committee suggests early acquisition of sites according to the plan before the development takes place.

DONALD E. GINGERY, *Chairman.*  
JOHN W. BROOKFIELD.  
Brig. Gen. THOMAS A. LANE.  
FREDERICK A. GUTHEIM.  
ROY BRAGG.

MAY 29, 1956.



APPENDIX

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,  
OFFICE OF PLANNING COMMISSION,  
COUNTY OF FAIRFAX,  
Fairfax, Va., November 28, 1955.

Mr. MAX WEHRLY,  
Chairman, National Capital Regional Planning Council,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned members of the Fairfax County Planning Commission, have studied the report of Clarke and Rapuano advocating the location of the new CIA headquarters on the 749.5-acre Federal property at Langley, and wish to make the following comments:

(1) The statement is correct that the county of Fairfax has assured the CIA it will install adequate sewage facilities to serve the Agency within a period of 2 years. The county is amply able to fulfill this commitment from proceeds of a recent \$20 million sewer bond issue.

(2) We have confirmed the fact that the city of Falls Church has committed itself to supply an adequate water supply to the site, and that it has both the facilities and the financial ability to do so. At the present time Falls Church is having a 36-inch supply main installed in the new Little Falls Dam, almost adjacent to the proposed CIA site, and has already paid the Army engineers for such installation. This will be direct connection with Dalecarlia Reservoir and is in addition to its present connection there—through the Arlington County mains on Chain Bridge.

(3) The statement is correct that the Department of Highways of the State of Virginia has committed itself to improve State Road No. 123 from its present 2 lanes to a divided 4 lane highway from Langley fork to its crossing of the extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

(4) We understand that the Congress of the United States has authorized \$8,500,000 for the extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from its present terminus at Spout Run, above Key Bridge, to the Langley site if CIA locates there, and has actually appropriated the initial \$2,500,000 for this purpose.

(5) We have confirmed the fact that the county of Fairfax has committed itself to the sum of \$110,000 as its one-fourth share of the cost of acquiring rights-of-way for said parkway extension within this county, and that the Virginia Department of Highways has committed itself for its matching share. We consider the total of \$440,000 for this purpose, including Federal matching funds, to be ample to acquire such rights-of-way from the Arlington line to the proposed site of the Cabin John Bridge, near Dead Run.

(6) Your attention is called to the statement contained in the Clarke and Rapuano report that these improvements will adequately care for the anticipated traffic needs of CIA at the Langley site.

We wish to call your attention, however, to additional traffic improvements which appear to be in prospect, and which will increase greatly the above service to the Langley site:

The outer belt freeway, which is to circle the District of Columbia, will cross the Potomac on Cabin John Bridge, within a few thousand feet of the Langley site of CIA. This entire freeway has, within the past 2 months, been taken into the Interstate System of Highways, making it subject to 60-percent participating Federal funds. Under the Federal highway bill which is expected to pass at the impending session of Congress, we understand this Federal participation will be increased to approximately 90 percent.

In addition, we are informed that funds have already been appropriated to extend and grade Canal Road from Chain Bridge to the proposed site of the Cabin John Bridge, this extension to be a part of the George Washington Memorial Parkway on the Maryland side of the Potomac.

Two traffic lanes are also to be added to Key Bridge, with a northbound connection therefrom to the memorial parkway at Rosslyn. This will greatly aid traffic from northwest Washington toward the Langley site. The proposed Roosevelt Island Bridge, also connecting with the memorial parkway, will be an additional service for Langley-bound traffic.

In addition to the above existing, or immediately impending, highway facilities serving the Langley site, there is under discussion the replacement of the existing Cabin John streetcar tracks and their replacement by a highway to the Cabin John Bridge site, which would also become a high-level lane of the George Washington Memorial Parkway. In connection with this, there is also under discussion a proposal to double-deck Chain Bridge, the upper deck to connect with such parkway lanes.

We have conferred with the proper officials of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., of Virginia, and of the Virginia Electric & Power Co., and have been told by both that they have assured CIA of adequate telephone and electric service at the Langley site.

We are, therefore, convinced that completely adequate sewage, water, telephone, electric, and highway facilities are assured to CIA if it locates at Langley, and that even more highway facilities are in early prospect.

#### CONVENIENCE TO EMPLOYEES

We agree with the Clarke and Rapuano report's statement that "in the circumstances, we doubt whether more than a very few of the CIA employees will find it necessary to change their places of residence by reason of the location of the headquarters at Langley; this site, we believe, is the most convenient to the largest number."

A study of the highway map contained in the Clarke and Rapuano report, in conjunction with the employee-distribution map, can leave no doubt of the desirability of the Langley site from the viewpoint of the employees of CIA.

We consider the ability of CIA employees to retain their present residences if the Agency is located at Langley to be of extreme importance. It gives assurance that the areas in which they now live will not be damaged by their sudden departure, and that the Langley-McLean area will not be unduly burdened by the sudden influx of thousands of new families. The natural growth expected in the Langley-McLean area as a result of the completion therein of the community's \$2-million sewerage system next year, and the great extension of water mains by the city of Falls Church, can easily absorb such CIA employees as may desire to move there. The recent completion of a new elementary and a high school at McLean and the passage of a \$20 million school bond issue for additional school construction in Fairfax County on November 8, assures adequate school facilities.

#### EFFECT ON AREA

We agree that the statement in the Clarke and Rapuano report that there "is no reason for concern on the part of those who predict that any governmental development is bound to result in large areas being given over to small lots with accompanying commercial developments," and that if the Fairfax County zoning authorities take their task seriously and uphold the zoning scheme (master plan) as at present planned, "then there need be no cause for concern."

The recently elected new supervisor from Dranesville District, which includes the Langley-McLean area, gave repeated assurances during the campaign that he favored the adoption of the master plan, and would maintain strict zoning in the area if elected.

In a "Letter to the Editor" published in a local newspaper on September 16 last, he said, "As you know, I am not opposed to the CIA's locating here. The voters of Dranesville District may rest assured that I will hold the line for strict and rigid zoning."

At a public meeting of the McLean Citizens Association on Monday, November 21, he told those present that he had conferred with most of the other newly elected members of the board of supervisors, and could assure them that the master plan would be adopted, and that strict zoning would be maintained.

We further agree with the Clarke and Rapuano statement that impact of the Agency on the locality will be lessened by the fact that 69 percent of its employees living north of the Potomac as well as many of the 31 percent who live in Virginia, will reach the site via the Memorial Parkway along the river—and will thus have little contact with the area.

The further fact that the CIA buildings will occupy only a small part of the federally owned 749.5-acre tract, and that they will be surrounded by a wide belt of woodland, and thus not be visible from outside areas bordering the property—together with the statement of CIA Director, Allen Dulles, that the installation will consist of a number of college-type buildings, each surrounded by trees and each with its individual parking facilities—not only gives further assurance that the Agency will not damage the area, but rather, as the Clarke and Rapuano report says, "cannot help but become a distinct asset to the county."

#### LOCAL ATTITUDE TOWARD CIA

Though there has been a small and vociferous local group of residents opposed to the location of CIA at Langley, it is apparent to us that the great majority

favor it. In the large area between Langley and the Arlington line, between Pimmit Run and the Potomac—which our planning director has designated as the only area directly affected by the move—that residents owning over 80 percent of the land signed a statement that they did not object to CIA. (See attached map.)

The opponents of CIA, over a period of several months, circulated a petition asking that the master plan be adopted in the area, that the Bureau of Public Roads land at Langley be used for park purposes, and that no large Federal agency be located on that site. They finally presented to the National Capital Planning Commission the petition containing approximately 700 names—which, considering that both members of families and all children over 18 years signed it, doubtless represented only some 400 families at most. Those favoring CIA, presented a petition with some 2,600 names from the same area after only 1 month's solicitation. Both candidates for Dranesville supervisor in the recent election signed this latter petition, and the wife of the successful candidate helped circulate it.

#### WINKLER TRACT DEFECTS

We agree with the Clarke and Rapuano conclusion that the Winkler tract, in an area on Shirley Highway recently annexed from Fairfax County by Alexandria, is unsuitable for the CIA headquarters.

The November 25 issue of a county newspaper quoted a lifelong resident of Alexandria, and leading political figure, as stating the Winkler tract was "a swamp. I, grazed cattle on it for years, and had to put on hip boots before going to get them." This confirms the Clarke and Rapuano report that the land is "too low in relation to the Shirley Highway and to the surrounding area" to be suitable.

The architect for the proposed CIA headquarters added, at the NCPC hearing on November 15, that it was located on a gravel bed, and any large structure would require a floating foundation.

Statistics of the Virginia Department of Highways confirm the statement in the Clarke and Rapuano report that traffic on the Shirley Highway, which serves the Winkler tract, "has now reached its capacity, particularly from a point north of the Parkfairfax interchange to the Potomac River crossings." Your attention is called to the statement in the report that "even after it is widened to six lanes as far south as King Street, it will still be inadequate to accommodate the concentrated peak load that would result from the more than 3,000 automobiles of the CIA headquarters staff during the morning and evening hours."

We wish, however, to call attention to further demands on Shirley Highway which have not heretofore been considered. A vast development of new homes is now underway at Springfield, not far south of the Winkler tract, and many more such developments are now underway or contemplated. Over 2,000 homes have been built during the past year, and more than 3,000 more are in the construction or planning stage. This will add tremendously to the Shirley Highway traffic.

Also the fact should not be lost sight of that a large Federal airport is being contemplated at Burke, traffic for which would use the Shirley Highway beyond the Winkler tract. Though this project is being strongly protested by local residents, the Government has already acquired over 1,000 acres of the proposed 4,000-acre site, and there is a strong likelihood that the airport will eventually become a reality. If so, the airport traffic, added to that existing, plus additional from the thousands of homes under construction or contemplated, would make the Shirley Highway a nightmare if CIA traffic were added to it.

We further feel that the difficulties which would be encountered by the 69 percent of CIA employees living north of the Potomac in reaching the Winkler tract, would shortly result in a large percentage of them being forced to move to the area, thus greatly overburdening the schools and other public facilities, as well as harming the areas from which they moved.

In view of the above analysis, we agree wholeheartedly with the Clarke and Rapuano conclusion that "the site at Langley is, in our opinion, the best possible site we know to be available which meets the established criteria. We unhesitatingly recommend it."

Very truly yours,

Keith Price, Chairman; J. W. Brookfield, Vice Chairman; Joseph P. Baker, O. V. Carper, Austin E. Hollway, George Landrith, A. Slater Lamond, John W. Rust, Col. Gilbert Thompson.

BRIEF OF PRIMARY FACTORS CONTAINED IN CLARKE AND RAPUANO REPORT

The Clarke and Rapuano report proposes that approximately 140 acres of the 750-acre Government-owned property at Langley be used as a site for the new CIA headquarters building.

A major factor considered was the accessibility of the site to the several official departments and agencies with which we are in daily contact. These departments and agencies are located generally in the northwest District of Columbia and adjacent Virginia area.

The development of 140 acres of this 750-acre Government-owned tract for CIA will be such that a wide belt of forest land will be left around the periphery in a manner aiding to provide the desired security. Building on this admirably suited site can be accomplished without changing its parklike character. As the Langley site is already owned by the Federal Government it is unnecessary to acquire additional property or to take additional properties from the tax rolls. If expansion should become necessary, adjacent Government-owned property would presumably be available.

The largest number of our employees (over 68 percent) presently reside in Washington and adjacent Maryland. The Langley site is very convenient to the residences of a large portion of this majority. The CIA located at Langley would not impose serious problems of new population in the community because the larger number of CIA employees could and would continue to live in their present residences. Additional commercial developments need not result from locating CIA headquarters at Langley because this majority of employees, as well as some Virginia residents, will enter the property via the George Washington Memorial Parkway. The parkway will be situated on park lands north of the CIA site or on the opposite side of the property from the Langley area.

To effect the minimum burden of CIA traffic on downtown Washington and the Pentagon area, our preferred site should be in the northwest quadrant of the Greater Washington area. To locate the CIA at Langley would help solve the most difficult problem of averting further traffic congestion in a congested part of Washington.

The only highway and bridge improvements necessary to accommodate CIA traffic to and from the Langley site are as follows:

1. Extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway on the Virginia side of the Potomac from its present terminus at Spout Run to the Langley site. Congress has authorized \$8.5 million and approved an appropriation of \$2.5 million in the agency's building legislation to accomplish this construction if the Langley site is chosen.

2. Planned improvements to Key Bridge. A contract has been awarded by the District of Columbia for the planned Key Bridge improvements and construction is expected to begin in January 1956.

3. Widening of Route 123 to four lanes from its intersection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway to Route 193 beyond Langley. The department of highways, State of Virginia, has agreed to finance and complete this construction concurrently with construction of the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

These three improvements, which will ultimately be required whether or not the CIA is located at Langley, will provide a satisfactory access to the proposed site now. The traffic situation at Langley will gain further superiority as the already planned arterial system in this general area takes form, especially the outer loop freeway and the bridge at or near Cabin John, which would make this site ideal. The cost of these and other road improvements in this area which have been planned, scheduled, or contemplated, however, definitely should not be attached to the CIA project. It is highly improbable that there are sites in Virginia other than the Langley site to which a satisfactory situation would obtain with highway construction cost in excess of the estimated cost of the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

Water and sewer services have been guaranteed by the local jurisdictions at no capital cost to the Federal Government. The same situation holds true for commercially furnished utilities such as power, telephone and public transportation. For all utilities, CIA would merely pay the customary charges for services rendered.

(See inserted material following close of hearings for statement as to status of land acquisition.)

EFFECT ON COMMUNITY AREA

Senator THYE. Mr. Chairman, might I ascertain how many private homes are involved in the area?

Mr. DULLES. None.

Senator THYE. None whatsoever?

Mr. DULLES. No.

Senator THYE. Will this development here disrupt the normal community life of any of the communities out in that area by a change of highways?

Mr. DULLES. It is my hope that it will not.

Of course, the putting in of the George Washington Memorial Parkway will affect those who are on the roadbed.

Senator THYE. Do you anticipate any private homes that will have to be vacated and razed when that parkway goes in?

Mr. DULLES. I think that is possible, but the parkway has been planned since 1930 and has been on the statute books, I believe, since 1930 as a planned improvement.

Senator THYE. Otherwise, this project is all on federally owned land or what is now parkway, and therefore you will not have to disturb any private homes?

Mr. DULLES. Not the building itself. As I say, I cannot speak as to the effects of building a road. Any road affects certain things.

Senator CHAVEZ. But in those days, 1934, they were not thinking about the CIA, were they?

Mr. DULLES. I think that when this land was acquired, as I recall, it was acquired to be used for Government purposes. I do not think they were thinking of the CIA because the CIA was not in existence at that time.

Senator CHAVEZ. That is right. So they could not have been thinking about the CIA.

Mr. DULLES. That is right. It was acquired for Government use. There are certain small installations there now.

FUNDS FOR HIGHWAYS

Senator CHAVEZ. I think the last bill we had here, we appropriated some money for the highways.

Mr. DULLES. That is correct; \$2.5 million, sir, was appropriated for the highways.

Senator ELLENDER. To what extent will the rest of the land owned by the Government be affected by the establishment of this project that you contemplate?

Mr. DULLES. Well, the bulk of the rest of the land, except for the section of it that is taken by CIA and the section taken to put the parkway through, will be available for other Government uses, whatever the Government and the Congress decide.

Senator ELLENDER. There would be no restrictions?

Mr. DULLES. Not so far as we are concerned.

Senator ELLENDER. I guess you can hide yourselves in 125 acres?

Mr. DULLES. Yes, sir.

Senator CHAVEZ. Let us get down to the other end of it.

The District of Columbia is the seat of Government or the Government has lots of local space within the District of Columbia. I am not talking about parkways, but I am talking about vacant land

within the District of Columbia, and if I recall, the justification for giving you a building is that you are now working under a handicap by having about 40 buildings all over town?

Mr. DULLES. Most of them temporary, sir.

Senator CHAVEZ. Most of them temporary.

OBJECTION TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LOCATION

What is the difficulty of locating a building within the District of Columbia that would answer your purpose?

Mr. DULLES. There are two answers, or several answers, Senator.

One is that it is very hard to find and it would be very costly to acquire that land in most cases.

Senator CHAVEZ. I am talking about Government land. I am not talking about land that belongs in fee to someone named Tom Jones. I am talking about those that belong to the District of Columbia.

Let me give you an example.

Mr. DULLES. Yes.

Senator CHAVEZ. On 14th and Constitution, there is a temporary building there. What would be wrong about using that to build you the kind of a place that you need and that is necessary, without going to buy some new property outside of the District of Columbia or using property that belongs to the Government outside of the District?

Mr. DULLES. We are not buying any land, as you realize.

Senator CHAVEZ. I realize that, but you are going outside of the District.

What would be wrong to use some local spot that belongs to the Government now within the District of Columbia, and I want to help you; I really do. I think you need a building. I do not want you to have 40 buildings; I think you have to have 1 building.

Mr. DULLES. We have not found any such available land, Senator. There may be such, but in our explorations we have not found it and, further, when we started this we were under, and still are, the view that a certain dispersal of Government buildings is desirable. You have reached the situation of such saturation insofar as parking is concerned in the District of Columbia, that you have really a very serious problem in adding more buildings.

The State Department is adding a large annex now.

Senator CHAVEZ. I think the serious problem is the agencies. I think those are the ones who are being taken care of and not the comfort of the fellow who works for the agency.

Mr. DULLES. I do not quite follow that.

Senator CHAVEZ. Follow it this way:

I am sold on the idea that CIA needs a building of its own, but I think that should be the justification to have CIA function properly the way they should according to the obligations and the duties and so forth. I want that. But I do not see why we should be concerned about where the fellow parks his car who works within the agency.

Mr. DULLES. The morale problem is a very serious one.

Senator CHAVEZ. I know.

Mr. DULLES. As far as your workers are concerned and the loss of time, you may lose an hour a day in trying to find spaces to park your car in going from where your car is parked to your place of work.

Senator CHAVEZ. What about losing time from Prince Georges County to the place that you have in mind, and from Montgomery County?

CONVENIENCE OF EMPLOYEES

Mr. DULLES. We have taken the actual location of our employees where they now live, and with the road nets that are prospective, to be built in the near future. The location that we propose, we believe, will be more convenient to our present employees than the one where we are.

Senator CHAVEZ. I am not criticizing your position whatsoever.

Mr. DULLES. I know, Senator.

Senator CHAVEZ. But I would like to have the city of Washington still exist. The Constitution makes the city of Washington the seat of government and, if it is at all possible, as far as I am concerned, I would prefer to have you be within the District of Columbia instead of having the boys coming from Montgomery County, Prince Georges and Arlington and elsewhere going over there to Langley.

Mr. DULLES. Of course, the practical situation is that so many of your Government workers now do live outside of the District of Columbia. They are really part of the city of Washington. Washington has grown outside the boundaries that our forefathers fixed for us. There is nothing much we can do about that.

LOCATION OF EMPLOYEES

Senator ELLENDER. What percentage of the employees live outside Washington?

Mr. DULLES. That chart behind you shows the location of our employees.

Would you just point to that, please?

Senator CHAVEZ. Locate Langley first.

[redacted] This is Langley [indicating]. Thirty-seven percent live in Northwest Washington. We have 5 percent in Northeast, 7 percent Southeast, and 1 percent in Southwest. So that is a total of 50 percent.

Senator ELLENDER. Within the District?

[redacted] Within the District.

Senator ELLENDER. And 37 percent of that is pretty close to Langley?

[redacted] Practically across the river, in the Northwest section.

Senator THYE. You would cross that Chain Bridge? Is that where your crossing would take place?

[redacted] This is the location of Key Bridge. That would be available as well as Chain Bridge and Memorial Bridge.

Senator THYE. Not in the morning. If you took them from Northwest and you came down Memorial, or you came to Key Bridge, you would be simply going into the stream of your District traffic.

Mr. DULLES. That is where they all go now. Less would go in that stream at the new location than go in it today. We would take them out of the stream.

Senator THYE. I grant you that but, nevertheless, you are going into that same stream to branch off and that is what you are endeavoring to avoid.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

741

Mr. DULLES. If we built in the District, then they would all go into that stream.

Senator ELLENDER. The chances are if you build in Langley, quite a few people would find it convenient to get homes there and leave the District?

Senator CHAVEZ. I am thinking about the economic life of the District and not by way of criticism of your idea.

Mr. DULLES. I understand.

Senator CHAVEZ. But, after all, they do not have a vote and Senator Ellender has to worry about them when we should be worrying about our home States, but we do have to worry because it is our responsibility. We do have a duty to the District people.

Mr. DULLES. Colonel White would like to say a word.

Mr. WHITE. If I might point to that chart for the residencies, first of all.

ACCESSIBILITY OF LANGLEY SITE

The location of Langley is more convenient to our employee residencies than is our present headquarters. You will note there are 31 percent that live in Virginia and Langley would certainly be as convenient to them as is our present location.

If you look also at the 37 percent in Northwest Washington and the 11 percent in Montgomery County, looking to the future, and I think this is a long-range project, the road net which is planned there will make the Langley site most accessible to the large majority of our employees; as a matter of fact, all except the 20 percent which you see in the lower right-hand corner of that map.

From talking with our employees at great length we feel that the employees of our agency will not relocate. There will be some, sure, but there will be no real incentive for them to transfer their residencies over to the Virginia area or to spend their money at any place except where they are spending it now because I think this site would require a very minimum of relocation.

TRAFFIC SITUATION

Then the second point, as to the traffic situation, if I may refer to the next chart there, it is certainly true that if we threw all of our traffic across Chain Bridge that we would overload it. However, we have tried to analyze this situation very carefully, and if I could illustrate with this chart, the hours with which we are most concerned are between 7 and 9 o'clock in the morning and between 4 and 6 o'clock in the afternoon.

Take Chain Bridge, for example:

Under the "in" column, this indicates the number of cars coming into the District.

In the "out" column, the number of cars going out of the District. These are official Bureau of Public Roads statistics taken over some period of time, as of last September.

Between the hours of 7 and 8, there is an unused capacity of 1,199 going out of the District. Between 8 and 9, it is 1,204.

Then, coming back into the District in the afternoon, there is an unused capacity of 938 between 4 and 5 and over 1,000 between 5 and 6.

Now, without going through that same detail for all the bridges, by looking at Key, Memorial and Highway Bridges, you see that we



have a very substantial unused capacity for those bridges, and even if we did not put car one over Chain Bridge, there is still plenty of capacity to carry our traffic.

TRAFFIC OVER KEY BRIDGE AND MEMORIAL BRIDGE

Senator CHAVEZ. Sir, statistics have been shown before the Public Works Committee over and over again, indicating that 96,000 cars cross Key Bridge and Memorial Bridge every day of the week.

Mr. WHITE. Yes, sir.

Senator CHAVEZ. How are you going to meet that traffic?

Mr. WHITE. This, sir, is an actual count of the capacities of all the bridges, and these are the official statistics of the Bureau of Public Roads as to what that bridge is carrying now. These statistics do include the Key Bridge as well as the two lanes which are being added, sir. It does not include the Roosevelt Bridge, which I believe it is reasonable to expect will be in by the time we are there.

So, inasmuch as our traffic would be moving counter to the normal flow of traffic coming into and going out of the District, we believe that this would certainly relieve the congestion greatly rather than complicate it.

Mr. DULLES. Our flow is largely counterflow.

Chairman HAYDEN. You are going on through your statement, I believe.

COST ANALYSIS

Mr. DULLES. The Public Buildings Service, in coordination with this agency, has negotiated an architect-engineer contract with the firm of Harrison & Abramovitz.

Mr. Abramovitz is here and Mr. Poorman is here, representing the Public Building Service, if you have any questions to ask of them.

The architects have prepared a preliminary site plan and schematic drawings of the proposed headquarters installation, together with supporting architectural and engineering information, on the basis of which the Public Buildings Service has prepared its cost analysis and estimate.

If we can get this chart where we can see it, it would be a help. I do not know whether we can do it successfully. We can show the building pretty easily here.

BLOCK-TYPE WING BUILDING

This building, as recommended by our architects, is a block-type wing, most satisfactory in meeting our special requirements. The general arrangement and layout of the office space in the new building have been designed with security considerations primarily in mind.

The block-type wings are readily compartmented from one another, so that specially restricted areas can be established and special security controls maintained in each section, with a degree of flexibility not otherwise practicable.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that this building is *not in any sense lavish*. Our architects assure us that it is much more severe than typical office buildings being constructed for private clients, and it is my own belief that its austerity will far exceed that of any modern Government office building.

We could not build this building in the District under the Fine Arts rules. We can get it outside because we do not have to conform.

Senator CHAVEZ. The only difficulty is with the Fine Arts that they do not appropriate anything for the construction.

Mr. DULLES. We have nothing lavish, nothing of the ornamental type because everything is going into utility.

#### TOTAL ACREAGE

Senator CHAVEZ. But you have how many acres?

Mr. DULLES. One hundred twenty-five acres. A good deal of that would be parking space. We expect to maintain the trees as much as possible.

Senator CHAVEZ. The building would take that much acreage?

Chairman HAYDEN. Oh, no.

Mr. DULLES. That is roadways, approaches, and so forth.

The aerial photograph on display is to scale.

Senator CHAVEZ. Explain the area enclosed by the red lines.

[ ] This is the property.

Mr. WHITE. That property which he is outlining is the property that would be transferred to us. The property between that and the river is for the National Park Service.

Senator ELLENDER. Is the 125 acres represented by this model?

Mr. WHITE. Yes, sir.

Senator ELLENDER. One hundred twenty-five acres?

Mr. DULLES. Yes, sir.

Senator ELLENDER. The building seems to take about a third of it, nearly.

Mr. WHITE. Sir, the parking area is roughly contained in this area which he is now pointing out, so that with the parking area filled and with the road net, we will have good landscaping but not any elaborate acreage to play around with.

#### OFFICE SPACE

Mr. DULLES. Our plans are based on average net office space of approximately 98.5 square feet per person, in comparison to a governmentwide average of 112 square feet in the Washington metropolitan area.

Even so, the Public Buildings Service and our architects believe it impossible to construct, within the \$46 million authorized, a building which will accommodate all of our personnel. However, that is all I am asking for at this time.

If that is all you decide to give now or later, we will make do with it.

#### HISTORY OF COST ESTIMATES

I would like to review briefly the history of our cost estimates.

1. PBS's original estimate, March 1955, was \$50,840,000.
2. In our hearings at the Bureau of the Budget, April 1955, this was rounded off to \$50 million.
3. The Congress reduced our authorization to \$46 million.
4. Construction costs have risen 5.72 percent during the past 12 months. Present estimates are also slightly higher because they are

based on specific plans for a specific building on a specific site, rather than being in the abstract.

5. The present estimate by PBS and our architects, May 1956, for an austere building to house the entire agency is \$55,980,000.

Senator ELLENDER. How much is that above the original estimate?

Mr. DULLES. That is \$5,140,000 above the original estimate made by the Public Buildings Service, and about \$10 million above the congressional authorization.

Senator ELLENDER. How about the parkway road?

Mr. DULLES. That is not included.

Senator ELLENDER. I understand, but will that not be increased, too, over and above the estimate?

Mr. WHITE. We have a very recent estimate from them, sir, within the last 2 months, and it has not increased.

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I am compelled to leave in a few minutes, may I have about 2 minutes to make a statement here?

I was chairman of the subcommittee that originally authorized this bill.

Chairman HAYDEN. Yes.

#### NECESSITY FOR BUILDING

Senator STENNIS. We were very much impressed with the necessity for this building and I actively supported it all the way through on the authorization.

I was impressed with your scattered location where you operate now, the great number of employees, and I thought then you really needed a real dispersal, but I changed my mind some on that.

Anyway, I supported this building at the \$46 million and I studiously avoided getting into, and our subcommittee did the same, with regard to the location. We thought that was something you could decide.

It was the considered opinion of this Congress last year, after the most thorough consideration by the House and the Senate, that \$46 million, if it was going to be built away from the more ornamental part of the city, was certainly enough money to take care of it.

As I remember, the Senate helped get the figure raised from what the House had in conference?

Mr. DULLES. That is correct.

#### AUTHORIZATION FOR PARKWAY EXTENSION

Senator STENNIS. We authorized \$8.5 million for the parkway extension as an access to this site if you saw fit to use it. We thought that was an improvement for traffic generally and investment by the Government, and also, if you did that, you would not have to buy any land but could use land you owned.

Mr. DULLES. Yes.

Senator STENNIS. But using the land that the Government already owned, we certainly thought that \$46 million was enough money, and I still think so; and I have not heard of anything, any basis, for the Congress to change its position on that, and I do not think we ought to increase that authorization now, certainly not without full hearings,

and I do not think we ought to permit the expenditure of this money in such a way as will make it necessary to authorize \$10 million more later.

Mr. DULLES. I can assure that we do not propose to put the Congress in this position.

Senator STENNIS. I say that to you with great deference, Mr. Dulles. I am sure you are very sincere in this idea of your needs, but I believe that we are going to have to draw a line somewhere and stop these figures at some point, and I know this one did have the fullest consideration last year and it was in the hands of friends, in a way, in the Congress.

PREPARED STATEMENT

(The formal statement of Mr. Dulles follows:)

STATEMENT BY DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

1. Introduction

(a) The Congress, in title IV of the Military Construction Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 349), authorized \$46 million for the construction of a CIA headquarters building, together with \$8,500,000 for the extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from its present terminus at Spout Run to a point near Langley in Fairfax County, Va., if the agency finally selected a portion of the Government-owned Bureau of Public Roads property as the building site.

(b) The Congress initially appropriated (ch. III of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1956; 69 Stat. 453) \$5,500,000, with the understanding that \$3 million of this sum was for the preparation of detailed plans and specifications for the headquarters installation, and \$2,500,000 for acquiring right-of-way and initiating construction of the parkway.

(c) I am here today to request the appropriation of the balance of the authorized funds—\$49 million—of which \$43 million is for the building and \$6 million for the extension of the parkway.

2. Site

(a) When the Congress suggested last year that we study carefully the location of our proposed headquarters building, we engaged Clarke & Rapuano, a firm of consulting engineers and landscape architects of outstanding reputation in this field, to survey all the available sites and recommend the one best suited for the Agency's purpose.

(b) Their study resulted in a strong recommendation of a portion of the federally owned property presently occupied by the Bureau of Public Roads at Langley, Va.

(c) Located on a 125-acre tract, part of a larger 750-acre Government reservation, the Langley site was chosen as the one location, among many sites inspected in detail, most adequate for safeguarding the security of CIA's operations and for conducting those operations with the greatest measure of economy and efficiency consistent with security considerations. This site is bordered along the Potomac by parkway land, a belt 750 to 1,000 feet wide, under the control of the National Parks Service, affording an added measure of protection. The isolation, topography, and heavy forestation of the site provide additional security safeguards. It is efficiently located with respect to overcoming rush-hour traffic conditions, and it permits easy access to the White House, the National Security Council, and the State and Defense Departments, with which the bulk of CIA day-to-day coordination activities are concerned.

(d) The Agency approved the recommendation of Clarke & Rapuano and, as required by law, proposed it for consideration by the National Capital Planning Commission. The National Capital Regional Planning Council (5-3) and the National Capital Planning Commission (7-5) approved the Langley site on December 5, 1955, and February 3, 1956, respectively.

(e) In addition, the Fairfax County Planning Commission, the Arlington and Fairfax County Boards and the Falls Church City Council have all endorsed this location.

(f) With your permission, I shall submit for the record the reports of the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Capital Regional Planning

Council and the Fairfax County Planning Commission, and a brief of the primary factors contained in the Clarke & Rapuano report and a statement as to the status of land acquisition.

(See pp. 727 to 737.)

(g) While there has been some persistent opposition by a minority of local residents, the large majority favor CIA at Langley. This was best indicated in a poll conducted by Congressman Broyhill, which showed that 73.3 percent of Fairfax County voters favor this location with only 17.9 percent opposed and 8.8 percent having no opinion. In the Dranesville District, in which the site is located, the percentage in favor is even higher (77.5 percent). Ten thousand-five hundred five voters responded to Congressman Broyhill's poll, or a little more than 30 percent of the 35,286 polled. In the Dranesville District there were 1,789 votes for and only 517 against the site.

(h) In approving the Langley site, the National Capital Planning Commission indicated that it and the Regional Planning Council believed that certain long-planned highway improvements would need to be programed at an earlier date.

(i) We believe that the projected immediate extension of the parkway, and the widening of a portion of Route 123 to which the State of Virginia is committed, will provide adequate access to the Langley site without overburdening other existing facilities.

(j) The key to access to the Langley site is the ability to move traffic across the river. A study of Potomac River crossings demonstrates that adequate capacity exists for CIA traffic to and from Langley, especially since at the rush hours Agency traffic will be moving counter to the general flow. Location of the Agency at Langley will, in fact, remove an estimated 1,000 cars from the dominant flow of rush-hour traffic across the Potomac.

(k) A study of the locations of the residences of Agency employees demonstrates that those living east of the Potomac can use a variety of river crossings in commuting to and from the Langley site, and that the 31 percent living in Virginia will not have to cross the river at all. We are not, as some have alleged, preparing to throw three or four thousand cars across the Chain Bridge.

### 3. Costs

(a) The Public Buildings Service, in coordination with this Agency, has negotiated an architect-engineer contract with the firm of Harrison & Abramovitz. The architects have prepared a preliminary site plan and schematic drawings of the proposed headquarters installation, together with supporting architectural and engineering information, on the basis of which the Public Buildings Service has prepared its cost analysis and estimate.

(b) In considering the nature of the installation, a complete survey was made by the architects of the special requirements of the Central Intelligence Agency. Harrison & Abramovitz has recommended a building consisting of block-type wings as most satisfactorily meeting all the special and unusual requirements of the Agency. The general arrangement and layout of the office space in the new building have been designed with security consideration primarily in mind. The block-type wings are readily compartmented from one another, so that specially restricted areas can be established and special security controls maintained in each section, with a degree of flexibility not otherwise practicable.

(c) I cannot emphasize too strongly that this building is not in any sense lavish. Our architects assure us that it is much more severe than typical office buildings being constructed for private clients, and it is my own belief that its austerity will far exceed that of any modern Government office building.

(d) Our plans are based on average net office space of approximately 98.5 square feet per person, in comparison to a governmentwide average of 112 square feet in the Washington metropolitan area.

(e) Even so, the Public Buildings Service and our architects believe it impossible to construct, within the \$46 million authorized, a building which will accommodate all of our personnel. However, that is all I am asking for at this time. I would like to review briefly the history of our cost estimates.

1. PBS's original estimate (March 1955) was \$50,840,000.

2. In our hearings at the Bureau of the Budget (April 1955) this was rounded off to \$50 million.

3. The Congress reduced our authorization to \$46 million.

4. Construction costs have risen 5.72 percent during the past 12 months. Present estimates are also slightly higher because they are based on specific plans for a specific building on a specific site, rather than being in the abstract.

5. The present estimate by PBS and our architects (May 1956) for an austere building to house the entire Agency is \$55,980,000.

(f) While it is highly desirable to have all of our people in one building, we can operate with the more sensitive elements in one building and less sensitive operations elsewhere. With the block-type wing building we have in mind, we could add another wing later if necessary, without excessive increased costs.

(g) The block model is of a \$56 million building which would house the entire Agency. The shaded portions are those which would have to be omitted in a \$46 million building.

(h) A \$46 million building would provide space for all of our employees who are now housed in temporary buildings and would accommodate all of our highly classified activities. This will permit the evacuation of our temporary buildings so that demolition will be possible in accordance with Government plans for urban renewal in the District of Columbia, and as required by the act authorizing the building.

(i) I would like to emphasize that \$56 million is a current realistic estimate of the cost of providing one installation for all of our activities, and that it in no way reflects any change in our original requirements as we presented them to the Congress last year.

(j) I am seeking a building which the employees of CIA will find pleasant to work in and conducive to maximum production. I am not seeking luxury. Clean well-lighted offices; air-conditioning; partitioning adequate to our security needs; functional building and office arrangement which facilitates close teamwork and minimizes time lost in "commuting" from one building to another; a location convenient to present residences; adequate parking space in lieu of the parking situation at our present location—these I believe are reasonable goals.

#### 4. Savings

(a) With a \$46 million building it would be necessary to retain the permanent-type buildings we now occupy. With this arrangement, we estimate an annual saving in operating cost of approximately \$1,500,000.

(b) Consolidating all of our activities in a single building as originally planned (which would now cost \$56 million) would result in annual savings of more than \$3 million.

(c) There will in addition, in either case, be increased efficiency in the processing of intelligence information not readily measurable in monetary terms.

#### 5. Request

(a) I would like at this time to request that the Congress appropriate \$49 million, constituting the balance of the funds presently authorized, in order that the construction may proceed without delay or interruption.

(b) I hope you will concur in my view that it would be false economy not to construct a building adequate to house all of our people. The basic facilities such as heating, air-conditioning, elevators, etc., are being designed to service a building which would accommodate all of our employees. In January when our final plans will be nearing completion, if, in the judgment of the Congress, it seems wise to request that our enabling legislation be amended in order to provide for a building costing approximately \$56 million, I would propose to make such a request along with a request for the necessary appropriation (approximately \$10 million) with which to carry out the construction.

#### ADEQUACY OF APPROPRIATION

Mr. DULLES. I can assure you that we will not commit the Congress to another penny. We have our plans so that we can reduce or eliminate certain parts of the building and keep the expenses within \$46 million.

I wanted to tell you that I might speak to you next year to show the savings that would be incurred if you felt like giving us the additional amount. If the decision not to give the additional amount is arrived at, we will live with the \$46 million. We could still vacate our temporary buildings.

Chairman HAYDEN. I think the committee has heard about all we need to hear, Mr. Dulles. As I understand it, the House has included in the bill, as reported, this amount of money. The House acted favorably upon the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee and

the money is already in the bill as we understand it. Is that correct?

Mr. DULLES. Yes, sir, that is correct.

Senator DWORSHAK. How many will this accommodate?

Mr. DULLES. This is an open hearing. Under the legislation that has been passed, I do not testify as to the numbers of our personnel in open hearings, but I will be glad to send to your office a statement on the subject.

CLASSIFIED OPERATIONS

Senator DWORSHAK. Because of the nature of your highly classified operations, I wonder if the various embassies representing the satellite nations and the Communists are so stupid that they could not estimate how many employees you were housing in a building, the dimensions of which and the capacity of which have been widely publicized in the papers.

You are trying to tell this committee that this is highly classified material so that people who may not be counted on our side in this battling crusade against the Communist nations cannot find out what the facts are.

Before you answer, I am somewhat in accord with the comments expressed by the members of this committee, but I am very much discouraged and disappointed and disillusioned that we have been permitting the CIA to develop as we have with the expenditure of so much money; and there is not a man on this subcommittee with the possible exception of the chairman who knows how much money you get. Of course, it is not the business of the taxpayers or the Senate or the House to know. Probably you and the President alone have the information.

If you have only 5,000, 6,000, or 8,000 people in Washington processing this information which you get and gather all over the world, why do you not send these thousands of operatives out to get this information? What are you going to do? Are you going to house them over there in these lush quarters to process information? Is that where you find out what is going on in Russia and behind the satellite nations, over here on the banks of the Potomac?

Let us be realistic. We built a Pentagon and we had to fill it with personnel, and now we are building a little Pentagon and we have to fill that. Maybe the only way we can stop it, Mr. Dulles, as pointed out by my colleague from Mississippi, is to get a sensible administration to stop spending this money and dumping our dollars not only abroad but here.

So, I ask you, what are these people that you house going to do over there except spend most of the day going to work and getting back home? Are they the people who gather this very highly classified information behind the Iron Curtain? Are they?

Mr. DULLES. In addition to those at headquarters, there are throughout the world the representatives of the agency, the numbers of those which are not given, but I can assure you that they are there. They are doing, I believe, a very efficient, effective job in this battle against communism. That is the main thrust of my activities, and I think if I could sit down with you, we could go over together what we are doing.

AGENCY FUNCTION

Senator THYE. Your main business is not out here to stop communism; your main business is to determine what the situation is in respect to security over the world; is it not?

Senator CHAVEZ. All over.

Mr. DULLES. That is—

Senator THYE. This is a record that is being made, and I would hate to think you are superseding the military in the defense against communism.

Mr. DULLES. We have a role and the obtaining of information about what the Communists are doing and planning is a very essential element.

Senator THYE. That is your intelligence.

Senator DWORSNIK. Does the Government not do it?

Senator CHAVEZ. They do, but it is incidental to what they are doing.

VULNERABILITY TO AIR ATTACK

Senator DWORSNIK. I do not want to belabor this hearing, but probably we are overlooking the greatest potential asset involved in this thing. If it is true that we are engaged in a long-drawn-out struggle against the Communist nations and we are building up our Air Force and appropriating more money than the Bureau of the Budget requests, can we visualize for one second what a beautiful target this entire layout will be over on the banks of the Potomac if we should become involved in a shooting war and they want to drop a bomb over there to entirely destroy and obliterate this great brain power that is operating here as a safety valve for our country?

Are we setting that up just so that we can be accommodating a potential enemy? It is a terrible thing to work in many of these buildings scattered over the city. Maybe if a bomb is dropped in Washington or in this area, the District, it will destroy everything, but certainly we are rendering a great service to our potential enemies when we concentrate all of our intelligence efforts in one area.

Chairman HAYDEN. If there are no further questions, we thank you, Mr. Dulles.

Senator CHAVEZ. If you will indulge me for a moment, I think the Agency is absolutely needed.

Senator DWORSNIK. I had by no way implied it was not needed.

Senator CHAVEZ. My only point was that with respect to the criticism of the location, I was wondering why the building could not be located within the city of Washington and still serve the same purpose.

MEASURE OF DISPERSAL

Mr. DULLES. In line with the general desirability for a certain measure of dispersal in the modern world, the desirability of getting as high a degree of security as we possibly can, we have felt after consultation in high quarters that this measure of dispersal for this particular building was the wisest move to make.

Senator CHAVEZ. I can understand that and I appreciate it.

I have asked the General Services Administration, on my committee, to furnish us with a list of all of the property that the Government



owns that could be utilized for anything, whether it be this Agency or or any other agency, with the idea of utilizing that property without going elsewhere.

I am sincere about this District of Columbia business. It is the seat of government, to start with. All right; let them shoot. It is still the District of Columbia and the seat of government. We have so much property here, so why go elsewhere? I do not say that you might not be correct in the Langley, Va., area.

#### DWELLINGS FOR PERSONNEL

Senator ELLENDER. Mr. Dulles, does the Agency contemplate erecting any dwellings, houses or quarters for any of the employees on this 125 acres?

Mr. DULLES. No, sir.

Senator ELLENDER. It will be strictly for offices?

Mr. DULLES. That is correct. We have no authorization for building dwellings or quarters for the personnel, so it could not be done unless it were authorized.

Senator CHAVEZ. I was under the impression that because they are scattered all over the city, I could visualize the manpower that would be lost if they had to report from one city to another. I am referring to the man-hours that would be lost.

Mr. DULLES. And money, too. It costs us about \$3 million a year extra, and that could be saved if we could house all of our people under one roof, not counting the loss of time and efficiency which you have referred to.

Senator ELLENDER. You will probably cut down on the number of employees; will you not?

Mr. DULLES. We hope to. We believe that we can cut down on the number of employees.

Senator ELLENDER. I believe I will be around here for another 4 years, so I will want to compare this a little later.

#### CIA BUILDING LOCATION

### STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND

#### OPPOSITION TO APPROPRIATION

Representative LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this committee to present my views on the matter of an appropriation for the construction of a headquarters building for the Central Intelligence Agency at Langley, Va.

I am vigorously opposed to this appropriation because I feel that the construction of the proposed building at Langley, Va., would result in a ridiculous waste of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money. If the proposed headquarters building is built at the site selected in Langley, Va., there will be need for over \$30 million in additional funds to construct necessary roads to the site and to build another bridge across the Potomac or to increase the capacity of the existing bridges to take care of the greatly increased traffic across the river that such a new installation would create.

I might point out here parenthetically that the chart, which Mr. Dulles and Colonel White had, showed that 68 percent of the employees live on the opposite side of the river from the proposed site.

In addition, funds will be needed for a water-supply system and sewage-treatment facilities which are not now available at the Langley, Va., site.

There are many sites in the Washington area that comply, better than Langley, with criteria set up by CIA itself. Construction of the installation at any of these sites would save the American people many millions of dollars.

#### PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MD., SITE

One such location is owned by the United States and is located practically at the doorway to the Capital, at Edmonston and Good Luck Roads, near Riverdale, Prince Georges County, Md., which is in my district.

This tract has met all the criteria laid down by the CIA and would not need any additional construction of roads to meet the particular criteria for accessibility.

In addition, utilities are now available at this site which are not at the site in Langley, Va. Furthermore, the land is owned by the Government and it has been determined that the site is immediately available.

In addition to saving the taxpayers millions of dollars, construction of the CIA headquarters at the Good Luck Road tract would make the headquarters more convenient for a majority of the 8,000 CIA employees who, it has been determined, live in northwest Washington and in nearby Maryland. This site is one over which there is no controversy by the residents of nearby communities or the county governmental body and location of the headquarters here would not disrupt the nearby neighborhood as would location of the building at Langley, Va.

#### PLANNING AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION VIEWS

The December 1955 issue of Planning and Civil Comment, the official publication of the American Planning and Civic Association and the National Conference on State Parks, has this to say of the choice of Langley, Va., for the CIA headquarters:

However, in the city of Washington the location of new Federal buildings involves a process of conforming to the comprehensive plan and coordinating with citywide utilities. Under the dispersal plan adopted for defense purposes, and in the location of Federal buildings in the metropolitan area around Washington, there are in the existing communities many planning decisions to be reached. It is not simply a matter of the Federal agency deciding where it would like to be located regardless of the impact on the community. And when the agency is a large one which may employ some 10,000 persons, there should be taken into consideration the existing and potential access roads and bridges, the availability of water, sewers, schools, and shopping conveniences. States and counties are frequently in no financial position to provide these promptly but, if a site can be found which does offer these facilities, there is no reason for the Federal Government to undertake a large capital investment for a site not so served.

It is upon these principles that the committee of 100 on the Federal city of the American Planning and Civic Association has opposed the location of the Central Intelligence Agency at Langley, Va., where a community pattern for gracious living has been developed over a long period of years, where there are

at present no adequate access roads and bridges, where, apparently, the proponents of the site are depending unduly on the building in the near future of the George Washington Memorial Parkway for a use to which it should never be subjected. A parkway in hilly country is not designed for maximum traffic and is limited to passenger cars. In any case, the parkway is authorized and will be built when Congress appropriates the money, but it will not provide the business access highway which the CIA evidently expects it to be.

If the CIA headquarters were to be located where the dispersal act would indicate, the site would be further from Washington than any of those considered. But as a special dispensation Congress has authorized the CIA to choose a site nearer the White House. Since there are other sites which meet all the criteria set up, there is no excuse for disrupting the Langley neighborhood for taking over federally owned land that should be preserved as open space and watershed cover, for jeopardizing the memorial parkway by subjecting it to punishing uses, and by forcing the Federal Government to assume costs of utilities which there is little prospect that the State of Virginia or the county of Fairfax will provide promptly.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be a wasteful use of the taxpayers' money to go to the expense of building bridges and roads just so that the CIA headquarters could be located at Langley, Va. There are other sites available. There is one, as I say, in Prince Georges County. I have talked to Colonel White about this at some length. I asked him to please inspect this site, keeping in mind the criteria which had been laid down by the CIA.

When Colonel White went out to inspect it, he took into consideration only those roads which were then in being and did not take into consideration roads which were under construction. Therefore, he ruled it out as being too far away, taking too long to get there.

I think if you were going to apply the same criteria to one site, then you must apply it to other sites. They are counting on having the parkway built, and that is their access road.

Again, you have 68 percent of the employees who would have to cross the Potomac River every day going to and from their employment, and you know what bottlenecks bridges are.

#### UTILITIES IN BEING

We have a site, Government-owned, with access roads under construction and other roads planned which will give even better access to the site with all utilities in being at the site.

Chairman HAYDEN. Were these representations made both to the committee that authorized the construction of these buildings and the adoption of this site and to the Appropriations Committee of the House?

Representative LANKFORD. They were made to the Appropriations Committee of the House, yes, sir.

Chairman HAYDEN. As I remember, Congress did this: We authorized something to be done, but we left the site for future selection so that you did not have an opportunity to present the matter there. However, you have made these representations to the House committee.

Representative LANKFORD. The House Appropriations Committee, yes, sir.

Mr. Chairman, I have with me Mr. Frank Ewing, who is president of the Prince Georges County Chamber of Commerce.

May I make one more statement before I introduce Mr. Ewing. The CIA had these two gentlemen here make a study.

Mr. DULLES. Mr. Rapuano is here if you want to have him make a report.

Representative LANKFORD. I read this report and the site which I am proposing was dismissed with one short paragraph. I am completely at a loss. The majority of the report was taken up with the Langley site. The report was made after Mr. Dulles had expressed his very definite preference for the Langley site. I am not drawing any conclusions; I will let you draw your own as to that.

Now, I would like to introduce Mr. Frank M. Ewing, president of the Prince Georges County Chamber of Commerce. I think Mr. Ewing has an interesting observation to make.

Chairman HAYDEN. Do you have a prepared statement?

PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MD., CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

**STATEMENT OF FRANK M. EWING, PRESIDENT**

OPPOSITION TO LANGLEY, VA., SITE

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I do not have a prepared statement.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, if the CIA building is built at Langley, it certainly is reasonable and, in fact, probable that it will be necessary that these many millions of dollars be spent for roads, bridges, utilities, et cetera.

It seems, however, that in the normal development of roads and utilities that they depend one on another as a network and are developed for an overall community. It is true that for the number of other sites mentioned by Mr. Lankford, the roads and utilities have been developed and do exist as a long-term plan to serve the entire community.

We need lots of roads in our country, and we need lots of sewerage and water supply. There is a lot of work to be done in developing our country. It seems to me that it is unreasonable for us to spend this many millions of dollars for roads that are so badly needed, for sewerage and water extension that is needed for our overall use when they will be developed to serve principally one installation. If that installation could not be built and served with utilities which have a general utility value, I would not question that, but the utilities and roads do exist; they are sufficient to serve the CIA building at a number of other locations on Government-owned property, meeting the criteria of CIA.

It seems, therefore, a waste of Federal funds to rebuild these utilities specifically for this building.

Thank you.

Representative LANKFORD. If I may, sir, I would like Dr. T. B. Symons, who is a member of the Prince Georges County Chamber of Commerce to say just a few words.

Chairman HAYDEN. You may proceed, sir.

PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MD., CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

**STATEMENT OF DR. T. B. SYMONS, MEMBER**

DESCRIPTION OF PRINCE GEORGES TRACT

Mr. SYMONS. Gentlemen, we have been trying to present first to the Agency representatives and then to the Congress the idea that no personal interests are involved here with respect to the desir-

ability of the site in Prince Georges County, and particularly the site mentioned by Representative Lankford.

As a member of the chamber of commerce, we surveyed the situation and came to the agreement that the site mentioned which contains 100,000 acres surrounded by nothing that would be detrimental to the Agency, permitting it to develop it as they would see fit. The Baltimore Parkway runs through an edge of it. The Edmonston Avenue Expressway which is now in the process of development to Beltsville, and way beyond it, and other roads which have been cited are available.

Personally, it has been very difficult for me to believe that the arguments of Mr. Dulles and Colonel White and associates, as well as the Congress, can, in the best intentions and judgment, appropriate \$20 million when they could save that amount of money with sites that are now available.

The chamber of commerce acted very promptly in the matter. The people of Prince Georges County and the board of county commissioners have been very favorable towards the possible selection of a site in Prince Georges County and this particular site. I see Mr. Fisher is here who represents the people at Langley. Before the House committee, he presented a very wonderful argument about the objections of the people in that county.

Be that as it may, I am predicating it on the cold facts of necessity, convenience, and ability of this site to suit the conditions of the important agency that we believe will serve them adequately.

That is all.

We have Mr. Milke here who has worked for it at least 2 years. He is a member of our committee. Will you not say a word about the situation for us?

#### STATEMENT OF MR. MILKE

##### CRITERIA FOR SITE SELECTION

Mr. MILKE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the whole thing that occurred to me throughout these hearings on the desirability of locating in Langley or other locations is the fact that the officials of CIA made the criteria which they set down apply very strictly to all locations other than Langley. However, the only locations that these criteria were not applied to, as far as existing roads and the like were concerned, was Langley. I still think that that was not a very fair way to appraise the entire Washington area.

Thank you very much.

##### CIA BUILDING LOCATION

#### STATEMENT OF HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

##### SUPPORT OF LANGLEY, VA., SITE

Chairman HAYDEN. You may proceed, Mr. Broyhill.

Representative BROYHILL. My name is Joel T. Broyhill, a Representative in the House of Representatives from the 10th Congressional District of Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, the Langley area for the proposed CIA building is located in my district. In all deference to the previous spokesmen and also to the other gentlemen to whom they referred, I represent the people of Langley, Va., and I am here to support the request of the Central Intelligence Agency for the appropriation of \$49 million to construct the building on that site.

Most of the things that I intended to say have been covered by the CIA representatives, and in deference to the committee who, I know, is very busy, I would like to make these three very brief points.

#### NEED FOR BUILDING

First of all, it has been agreed by everyone that there is an urgent need for this building. The only thing I would like to caution the committee on is I hope no controversy over the actual location of the building will delay its construction, because they are now located in 34 buildings; let alone the security aspects of it, certainly the efficiency would be increased, and I understand they could actually operate the CIA for \$3 million a year less when all housed in one building.

Senator DWORSHAK. Will the gentleman yield for just one question?

Representative BROYHILL. Yes, sir.

Senator DWORSHAK. How many buildings were they located in before this new CIA agency was established? Did they have tents or buildings? What were they operating from before?

Representative BROYHILL. I do not know.

Senator DWORSHAK. If it is classified information, I will not ask that.

#### REMOVAL OF TEMPORARY BUILDING

Representative BROYHILL. Certainly the desirability of moving these unsightly tempo buildings cannot be disputed. They have been there for years. All of us want to get rid of them, and I hope a rider will be attached to this bill, which, when CIA moves out, would prevent any other Government agency from moving into them. I hope they will then be torn down.

Insofar as the study of this location is concerned, I think it was pretty well indicated in the authorization act last year, as well as the appropriation of \$5.5 million, that the building was going to be located at Langley when you authorized \$8.5 million for the extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway. Be that as it may, I can assure the committee that the CIA and particularly Colonel White, the Deputy Director, thoroughly explored every possible, feasible location that was presented to them. Every governmental representative from my area who had a suggestion of where this building could be located was able to be heard by Colonel White. Even the speculators who wanted to sell their land to CIA were received and considered thoroughly by Colonel White.

So, I do not think there should be any argument or criticism as to how thoroughly or how impartially they went into all of the available locations.

As to the argument of whether it should be located in the city or suburb, I do not think there is any argument with my colleague, Mr. Lankford, on that. Certainly with this, we recognize that the District of Columbia, the Government, the area itself, is growing and several other factors must be taken into consideration in the location of these

buildings rather than just the geographical boundaries themselves. Several of them were covered by Mr. Dulles a few minutes ago, the parking facilities, the impact on the traffic, which is already congested on many of the streets of the District of Columbia.

The convenience and location of the employees, the convenience of the Agency to other Government agencies with which they have to work, as well as the particular design of the building itself, as was pointed out here, must be taken into consideration. The building that they have planned is a very austere building. If that building had to be located in the District of Columbia on some city lot somewhere, the marble facing and things of that sort would cost several millions of dollars more.

Insofar as the specific site itself is concerned, I heard the previous witness here commenting on what the problem would be in State of Virginia. I feel I am a little more qualified to attest to that than he is.

#### COOPERATION OF FAIRFAX COUNTY

The county of Fairfax, the local community, the local governing body as well as the State of Virginia, including the Governor of Virginia himself, has assured the Central Intelligence Agency of their full cooperation in providing all necessary community facilities to properly serve this building, including the construction of adequate water facilities, sewer disposal facilities, and particularly highway facilities, as well as school facilities.

Senator ELLENDER. At no cost to the Federal Government?

Representative BROYHILL. At no cost to the Federal Government.

The only increase would be the George Washington Memorial Highway which was authorized a number of years ago by Congress and should have been constructed. I am glad to see the CIA come there to help accelerate the construction of that much-needed highway.

Chairman HAYDEN. Will this George Washington Memorial Parkway be for passenger automobiles only? Will the heavy trucks be off of it? What about it now?

Representative BROYHILL. It was originally designed for a beautiful scenic parkway. Of course, you know that it is needed for the actual use of traffic here today. We need that extra facility now. The George Washington Memorial Parkway that goes all the way down to Mount Vernon is one of our major thoroughfares here today. It serves two purposes—the need of traffic as well as being a scenic highway.

#### PARKWAY LIMITED TO PASSENGER AUTOMOBILES

Chairman HAYDEN. Will the George Washington Memorial Parkway between here and Mount Vernon accommodate trucks?

Representative BROYHILL. No, sir, just the ordinary traffic; no trucks.

Chairman HAYDEN. I had heard that heavy-duty trucks would be excluded from the parkway.

Representative BROYHILL. That is my understanding.

Chairman HAYDEN. If the Central Intelligence Agency requires heavy materials, how will trucks delivering that heavy material get there?

Representative BROYHILL. There will be other highways and roads. The State is going to improve and widen the roads which they maintain.

Chairman HAYDEN. This will not be the sole approach, then? The parkway will not be the sole approach?

Representative BROYHILL. No, sir. I doubt if you would need any heavy trucks in this except during the actual construction of the building. I do not know if they have heavy trucks going to CIA now or not.

#### SEWAGE FACILITIES

Senator THYE. Might I ask of the Congressman this question: What sewer facilities are there now in the area? You said that there would be ample sewerage disposal and those utilities furnished to accommodate the CIA installation.

Representative BROYHILL. They plan to construct them, Senator. There are no sewer facilities in that particular area.

Senator THYE. What community exists that you could levy a tax on or an assessment in order to raise the funds for sewerage disposal just for the CIA building?

Representative BROYHILL. Of course, this is a county of Fairfax activity. The board of supervisors themselves have assured the CIA officials that they would provide the sewer facilities. Whether they intend to float a bond or whether they have cash reserves at the moment, I do not know.

Senator THYE. But it is not like a city. It is just land with an occasional private homeowner in the area or it is agricultural land which is adjacent. Is that correct?

Representative BROYHILL. It is a residential area. It is not quite agricultural.

Senator THYE. But there are some agricultural acres out there, are there not? I am just trying to visualize what you are going to assess in order to raise the funds for sewerage disposal and the school buildings and everything that you are going to offer as you made in your statement.

You made the statement that all of these things would be made available. I was just trying to visualize who was going to bear the assessment to cover these expenses that you said would be furnished.

Representative BROYHILL. That was my statement, but I was merely conveying to the committee the assurance and the statement that had been made by the local governing officials to the CIA officials.

Senator THYE. That is what I was trying to get clearly in the record so that when the site was being developed we would not be confronted with the need here for additional highways and the need for sewerage and sewerage disposal and those things that could naturally be expected as a part of the services to such an installation.

#### FINANCING OF SEWER LINES

Representative BROYHILL. The actual cost of sewer lines in a county can be assessed against the property which it fronts when the owners of the property tap in to use the sewers.

Insofar as the disposal plant itself, unless they got it out of the general revenue, they would have to float a bond issue. I would im-



agine the assurance of the governing officials would be sufficient that there will be no expense to the Government to provide water and sewerage facilities as well as streets and roadways.

Senator ELLENDER. I do not think there would be objection to putting in the record that none of this money will be spent unless and until those facilities are made available.

Representative BROYHILL. I see no objection to that.

Senator ELLENDER. An important point raised by Mr. Lankford went to that.

Senator DWORSHAK. You would not be coming back asking for additional grants to help finance some of these facilities.

Representative BROYHILL. I will come back and ask for them, but maybe not necessarily for this particular thing.

With respect to the impact on the community, I am very much concerned about the attitude of the people in that area. It is a quite urban, semirural community, and this will have some bearing on the peaceful living of the community.

Senator THYE. They are not all in support of you.

Representative BROYHILL. I am particularly concerned from a political standpoint that there is some disagreement between some of my people.

Senator DWORSHAK. Will it be quiet in October over there?

Representative BROYHILL. I think I am in good shape, but I am very much concerned about this particular thing because, as I say, it is one of my best precincts.

Recognizing any community that we go into with the construction of a building that is large, it will have some effect on the community and there will be some sound, legitimate objections to it.

#### SURVEY OF COMMUNITY ATTITUDE

I took it upon myself to explore the pros and cons out there as to how the majority in that particular neighborhood felt. I have a county questionnaire and a postage-paid postcard which I should like to have made a part of the record.

Chairman HAYDEN. That may be done.

(The questionnaire and postcard referred to follow:)

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR NEIGHBOR: It has been my policy while serving as your Congressman to frequently consult individuals and groups of individuals on matters of local, State and National concern for opinions and often advice. This policy, on occasion, has been extended to all citizens of the 10th Congressional District of Virginia. You may recall a comprehensive questionnaire on major issues which invited your expression on important matters. I deem it the duty of a Congressman to keep his finger on the pulse of his constituency in order that he may best serve their interests.

At present two controversial issues directly affect the citizens of Fairfax County. On these I again desire to seek the advice of you in Fairfax County who are most directly concerned. I refer to the proposals to construct a second national airport at Burke, Va., and a new office building for the Central Intelligence Agency on the Bureau of Public Roads property at Langley, Va.

In reference to the Burke airport proposal, on the basis of a districtwide questionnaire and opinions expressed by citizens and citizens groups, I announced my opposition to this proposal. As a result the Commerce Department abandoned plans for the project.

However, some say that sentiment has undergone a change. People who previously opposed location of a new national air terminal at Burke have urged me to reexamine the entire matter. Organizations for and against the proposal have been created and have presented convincing arguments pro and con. The pro group has talked of economic advantages—taxwise and businesswise—and of a potential \$30 million annual payroll. The con group, just as convincingly, has argued that an airport at Burke would reduce property value, eliminate property from tax rolls, and provide an intolerable nuisance to the community and to the county. Both arguments have a high degree of validity. Undoubtedly certain economic advantages would be present. But whether they would outweigh the disadvantages is highly debatable.

At the present moment I have not changed my position in opposition to the project. However, it is only fair to my constituents and in keeping with my policy of consulting you, to determine once again your viewpoints. I feel that I should not take an adamant position; that my position should be in harmony with that of my constituency, particularly when I know that the facts have been made available to all.

With reference to the proposal to construct the Central Intelligence Agency office building at Langley, Va., there also appears to be a wide difference of opinion as to whether the building should be constructed in the Langley area. In addition, there have been several locations in northern Virginia which have been under consideration and have been very thoroughly surveyed. However, I have been informed by the top officials of the Central Intelligence Agency that as a result of these surveys, the only site in northern Virginia that will be considered by the CIA is the Bureau of Public Roads property at Langley.

While I feel that the location of this building in northern Virginia will be of economic advantage to the community as a whole, as well as accelerate the completion of the George Washington Memorial Parkway and the Cabin John Bridge, I am not unmindful of the opposition by the citizens of the surrounding neighborhood of Langley. There is, of course, quite a difference of opinion in the surrounding area as to whether or not this construction would impose a serious change in the complexion of the residential neighborhood as well as creating an additional traffic problem.

It is my belief that the facts on both proposals have been well publicized and the pros and cons well discussed by all citizens. Therefore, I am confident that your expression indicated on the enclosed self-addressed postage-paid card will give me an accurate consensus of the views of the citizens of Fairfax County. There is enclosed a card for each legal resident at your address and these cards have been divided into magisterial districts in order that the sentiments of the citizens immediately surrounding each project may be given special consideration.

I will appreciate your returning the enclosed card immediately, as I feel a decision must be made very soon on the CIA proposal. It is not necessary to sign the card. If you wish to sign it, your name and vote will be kept strictly confidential.

It is my hope that in this manner we can determine the majority opinions of the citizens of Fairfax County. It is the only democratic process I know which can resolve the issue. You are assured that your answer will help guide me in my conscientious and continuing effort to reflect your viewpoint and the viewpoint of every citizen of the 10th Congressional District regardless of political affiliation.

I am a firm believer in the axiom that given light, the people will find their own way.

Sincerely,

JOEL T. BROYHILL,  
Member of Congress.

Not printed at Government expense. Return postage paid by Congressman Joel T. Broyhill.

<b>FIRST CLASS</b> Permit No. 31053 (Sec. 34.9, P.L.&R.) Arlington, Virginia
<b>BUSINESS REPLY CARD</b> No Postage Necessary if Mailed in United States
— 3c POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY —
<b>CONGRESSMAN JOEL T. BROYHILL</b> House of Representatives Washington 25, D. C.

<b>MT. VERNON MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT</b>		
Dear Congressman Broyhill:		
My views on the issues discussed in your letter are as follows:		
Favor <input type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input type="checkbox"/>	No Opinion <input type="checkbox"/>
The construction of a second national airport at Burke, Virginia.		
Favor <input type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input type="checkbox"/>	No Opinion <input type="checkbox"/>
The construction of a new office building for the Central Intelligence Agency on the Bureau of Public Roads Property at Langley, Virginia.		
(Signature is not required, however if signed, names will be kept confidential)		
Not printed at Government expense — return postage paid by Congressman Joel T. Broyhill.		

FROM THE OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE JOEL T. BROYHILL, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

Representative Joel T. Broyhill (Republican of Virginia) today released the final tabulation of ballots returned from his questionnaire on the proposed CIA headquarters and a new national airport in Fairfax.

Fairfax County citizens voted overwhelmingly in favor of locating the Central Intelligence Agency on the Bureau of Public Roads Property in Langley. The vote was 7,702 to 1,881 with 922 indicating no opinion. The vote on the proposed second national airport in the Burke-Woodyard-Springfield precincts was closer as 5,544 voted in favor with 4,127 opposed and 834 no opinion. Since the questionnaire was mailed, the Department of Commerce has recommended to Congress the joint use of Andrews Airbase with Burke listed as their second choice.

The questionnaire was mailed to all 35,286 voters in Fairfax who were registered prior to November 8, 1955. The return of 10,505 (30 percent) of the ballot shows very high interest in these 2 proposed projects.

The tabulation of the ballots broken down into magisterial districts follows:

*Signed and unsigned returns combined*

	Burke Airport			CIA building		
	Favor	Oppose	No opinion	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
Centreville.....	609	233	40	737	89	55
Dranesville.....	1,172	743	446	1,789	517	55
Falls Church.....	1,102	1,049	98	1,697	318	234
Lee.....	565	340	36	657	141	143
Mason.....	560	823	62	930	310	204
Mount Vernon.....	827	394	62	772	344	167
Providence.....	710	545	91	1,120	162	64
Total.....	5,544	4,127	834	7,702	1,881	922
Percent.....	.628	.303	.070	.733	.179	.088
Total mailed, 35,286.						
Total returned, 10,505.						
Percent returned, .297.						

RETURN FROM QUESTIONNAIRE

Representative BROYHILL. One of the questions on the postcard asked whether the residents were in favor or opposed to—

the construction of a new office building for the Central Intelligence Agency on the Bureau of Public Roads property at Langley, Va.

I received back a 30-percent return from that questionnaire, maybe because it was a short question and also because the postage was paid, but it was a 30-percent return which I think the members of the committee would assume was a pretty accurate cross section of the views.

I would say the community was overwhelmingly in favor of this. A return of 30 percent represents approximately 73.3 percent in favor and 17.9 in opposition to it.

Insofar as the community itself is concerned, the only way I could determine that was to take the magisterial district in which this property was located. The returns from that showed 1,789 in favor of the project and 517 in opposition which amounts to 3½ to 1 in favor of the location of CIA in that particular community.

Actually, like a lot of politicians, I like to straddle the fence occasionally. I had to get off the fence on this one and go with the majority, and the majority is in favor of locating CIA in Langley even by the people in that locality itself.

ALEXANDRIA SITE

Senator DWORSHAK. What happened to the Alexandria site?

Representative BROYHILL. I had the people in Alexandria wanting it in Alexandria, and I had the people in Fairfax wanting it in Fairfax. For a while there, I did straddle the fence.

Senator THYE. Then you furnished the CIA with the information they listed here on page 4 relative to the percentage, the 73 percent being shown in Fairfax County, voters in favor of this location?

Representative BROYHILL. That is correct.

ASSURANCES

Senator ELLENDER. Mr. Dulles, has your Agency received the assurances that Congressman Broyhill has stated?

Mr. DULLES. We have.

Senator ELLENDER. There would be no objection on your part if we put in the report that none of this money is to be spent unless you get assurances of these facilities being furnished by the State of Virginia or the county of Fairfax?

Mr. DULLES. I would like to have Colonel White speak to that.

Colonel WHITE. We have written assurances from the State of Virginia, the Fairfax County Board, and the city of Falls Church.

Senator ELLENDER. Therefore, there would be no objection to putting that in the report?

FUNDS FOR SEWER CONSTRUCTION

Colonel WHITE. It is also my understanding that the Fairfax County Board has \$300,000 immediately available to undertake construction of sewerage facilities.

Chairman HAYDEN. Thank you.

Do you have anything further, Representative Broyhill?

Representative BROYHILL. No, sir.

Thank you very much.

Chairman HAYDEN. There are some other gentlemen here who want to be heard. Next we have Mr. F. G. Addison.

SECURITY BANK, WASHINGTON, D. C.

STATEMENT OF F. G. ADDISON, JR., PRESIDENT

LOCATION OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

Chairman HAYDEN. Do you have a prepared statement?

Mr. ADDISON. Yes, sir. It is a one-page statement and I have been requested to have copies for the members of the committee. I think perhaps by reading it, I would save time.

Chairman HAYDEN. Very well.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BANKERS ASSOCIATION RESOLUTION

Mr. ADDISON. My name is F. G. Addison, Jr., president of Security Bank, Washington, D. C. I appreciate your committee's permission to appear before you, as requested by the District of Columbia Bankers Association, to present a resolution recently unanimously adopted by

the members of this association. I ask permission to read the resolution and have it inserted in the records of this hearing.

The District of Columbia Bankers Association is deeply concerned with the number of Federal agencies that have announced their intention of locating outside of the District of Columbia and feels that the relocation of individual agencies should not be left to the head of that agency but should follow a standard operating procedure for Federal agency relocation.

The Constitution of the United States, article I, section 8, provides that—

the Federal District shall be the seat of the Government of the United States—and we feel there should be very compelling reasons before appropriations are authorized for governmental agencies to be established outside of the District. The Federal payroll is essential to the maintenance of the Capital City as the citizens of the United States would want, not as a citizen of the District of Columbia desires.

The members of our association are proud to be serving in the Capital of the Nation and trust that consideration will be given by your committee to the significance of the number of Federal agencies, and their employees, being transferred from the District of Columbia. These transfers and the resulting loss of important contributors to the economy of the city could be very far-reaching with disastrous effects on the maintenance of the Nation's Capital. We feel that the Congress should concern itself with this problem to the extent of adopting a policy that would require all buildings serving the executive branch of the Federal Government to be in the Nation's Capital unless the Congress passes upon the necessity of such buildings being built outside of the District of Columbia.

#### POLICY ON LOCATION OF AGENCY BUILDINGS

Chairman HAYDEN. If I understand you correctly, you are saying that there should be some policy established in regard to this matter. What I think has impressed the Congress in recent years, at least, is the idea that if all of the agencies were concentrated close to the Capital and an atomic bomb should be exploded here, then the Government would just be in no position to function at all. Therefore, there was a strong movement here for a time, at least, to get these various agencies away from Washington. I am not talking about just in the nearby Maryland and Virginia neighborhoods. I am really referring to greater distances away, and that demand seems to have ceased. As yet, there has been no policymaking body established to look into the necessities that you set forth here.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF POLICY

I think your suggestion is a wise one. I think the place where that policy should originate is in the Senate Committee on Public Works.

Senator Chavez has indicated that he has adopted, maybe not in all of the details, your point of view, so I think you would have a sympathetic hearing there. My suggestion would be that the District bankers draft some type of legislation that they would like to have the Congress enact; that they ask for a hearing on it and take it up, the Congress can consider it. It is very difficult simply to say

with the Public Works Committee so that this policy can be ironed out. If the committee makes a recommendation to Congress on that subject when one particular location is selected outside the District and another agency of Government says, "We want to go out"—in each one of those cases, the broad policy is not considered.

Is your organization prepared to come before a committee like the Public Works Committee of the House and Senate with a plan and a program that would result in such a study?

Mr. ADDISON. Senator, the resolution they adopted is one page long, and I think it covers the basis of that. If I may, I would like to read that and comment on your question if it is not covered. I believe it is covered.

#### CIA PERSONNEL

Senator DWORSHAK. Would you yield at that point?

I question the propriety of Mr. Addison including in his prepared statement an estimated figure of 8,000 employees. Do you realize the consequences of this if a copy of this should fall into the hands of the Soviet Embassy?

I think Mr. Addison should be forewarned as to the propriety of presenting a statement before this committee concerning CIA.

Mr. ADDISON. I am a mathematician to the extent that when they say that they are going to have 110 square feet per employee and they have 2,250,000 feet, I can pretty well arrive at that figure.

Senator DWORSHAK. Maybe the Soviets cannot figure that out, and I do not want you to furnish that information.

Mr. ADDISON. I will withdraw the figure of 8,000.

Senator DWORSHAK. You had better delete it.

Mr. ADDISON. Here are the statistics:

#### *Federal civilian employees December 31, 1955*

Central Intelligence.....	( <sup>1</sup> )
Coast and Geodetic Survey.....	<sup>2</sup> 892
Bureau of Standards.....	3,167
Mount Alto, VA Hospital.....	635
Weather Bureau.....	<sup>3</sup> 482
Atomic Energy Commission.....	1,252
National Security Agency.....	( <sup>4</sup> )
Navy Department.....	<sup>5</sup> 24,292
Navy Building.....	10,010
All other buildings and establishments.....	14,282

<sup>1</sup> Deleted for security purposes.

<sup>2</sup> Feb. 29, 1956.

<sup>3</sup> Not including employees at Suitland, Md.

<sup>4</sup> No data available as to the number.

<sup>5</sup> All.

Source: Above statistics obtained from Civil Service Commission, General Services Administration, and Veterans' Administration.

#### EFFECT OF TRANSFERRING FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

I would like to call your attention to the next sentence:

For every Federal employee leaving the District it can be safely assumed that there would be a reduction in at least one other civilian employee in the District and an average reduction of at least 3 to 4 District residents.

That is the statement covering the resolution. However, at that point, may I call your attention to how fast we are in this situation. The figures for the first 5 months of 1956 show that one-family dwelling units in the District of Columbia were granted for 188 for a total cost of \$3,500,000. In the 5 counties surrounding Washington, 5,577 units were built for \$72 million; 95 percent of every dwelling being built is being built outside of the District of Columbia.

#### SHIFT IN POPULATION

When we taken those figures and find—I make reference to the City of Washington in Trouble, U. S. News & World Report for July 6—it shows that in 1940 we had 474,000 white population; in 1950, we increased it to 518,000, and 6 years later it has gone down to where we have less white population in the city of Washington than we had 17 years ago. We now have in 1956, 465,000. We are reversing the situation.

The colored have increased from 28 to 35 and now represent 45 percent of our population. That 45 percent shows that as to major crimes, they committed 9,053 crimes as compared to the whites who committed 2,016. Juveniles, 1,438 colored to 376 whites. Venereal diseases, for gonorrhea among the white population, 19, and among the colored, 811; for gonorrhea and syphilis, 639 white to 12,400 colored.

Now, we have a situation that makes us seriously present this resolution to you and ask that it be made part of the record.

Chairman HAYDEN. That will be done and we thank you very much.

Mr. ADDISON. I thank you very much for the opportunity of appearing here today, sir.

(The resolution referred to follows:)

Whereas the District of Columbia Bankers Association has a prime interest in the economic health and welfare of our local community and this welfare depends almost exclusively on activities of the Federal Government which, directly or indirectly, sustain employment and purchasing power in the bulk of the District economy; and

Whereas it is of deep concern to the members of this association that a growing number of Federal agencies have indicated their intention to move out of the city, and of still greater concern is the fact that, in many cases, Federal officials would seem to be paying insufficient attention to economic and planning considerations in relocating; and

Whereas this is basically due to the fact that there presently exists no logical, step-by-step relocation procedure, and, in relocating, agency heads are merely supposed to contact the following authorities: Bureau of the Budget and Congress on requested appropriations; General Services Administration on planning of buildings; National Capital Planning Commission on planning aspects of the suggested relocation; and Office of Defense Mobilization on civil defense phases; and

Whereas officials charge that this process has grown haphazardly and is followed in the same way, specifically, that many agency heads are apparently unaware of the various clearances required in relocation, that clearances are not sought in any logical order, and that planning agencies are often treated as merely rubber-stamp routine, and, that most serious of all, final responsibility for relocation is left almost entirely up to each individual agency head; and

Whereas improvement of this situation must be made a top objective of our association if it is to fulfill its obligations to the community, the only lasting solution must be to establish a standard operating procedure for Federal agency relocation, with adequate authority to see it is enforced, Therefore, be it

Resolved, That:

- (1) Our association exert every effort within its power to help secure the establishment of an orderly procedure for relocation of Federal agencies, and
- (2) This effort include investigation of such specific alternatives as placing final authority for relocation within the Government Services Administration, and



(3) Members of our association stand ready to support whatever legislation or executive directive may be needed to accomplish the goal of this resolution, and

(4) They continue to give this effort their unstinting cooperation until a logical and orderly procedure for Federal agency relocation is finally secured.

#### CIA BUILDING LOCATION

### STATEMENT OF ROGER FISHER, LANGLEY, VA.

#### OPPOSITION TO SITE

Mr. FISHER. My name is Roger Fisher. I am a resident of the Langley-McLean area. I am one of those to whom Mr. Broyhill referred as not supporting his position. He represents us, but I do not think it is an open question as to how this should be handled.

I am here in behalf of some 700 of my neighbors who signed a petition opposing the construction of any large office building on this land.

I find it hard to know where to begin, and I believe that the Agency has decided where they want to go, and I feel that they have failed to present you with a balanced picture. I believe it is perhaps not deliberate, but it perhaps demonstrates the old maxim of the corrosive effects of power.

I would like to summarize the background of this and comment on particular points which have been covered already by the Agency and by other speakers here.

Chairman HAYDEN. Will you be as brief as you can, please? We have other witnesses who would like to be heard today.

Mr. FISHER. I shall try to be brief.

I am speaking not only in my own behalf but on behalf of other residents of the area.

Senator DWORSHAK. How many do you speak for?

Mr. FISHER. I will show you.

Senator DWORSHAK. Never mind.

Mr. FISHER. This is a map of the section of Fairfax County. The proposed site is marked "X." Each one signing the petition is represented by a pin in that map, living in the Langley area out beyond—

Senator ELLENDER. That is out of how many in that area?

Mr. FISHER. The bulk of ours is around the site.

Senator ELLENDER. What percentage of the population there does that show?

Mr. FISHER. I do not show—

Senator DWORSHAK. Would it be 10, 20, 30, or 40 percent?

Mr. FISHER. We asked 50 percent when seeking the petition. There has been an opposition petition circulated later which had 2,300 names of people "who were not opposed to the site." They used paid solicitors—a dollar an hour plus a nickel a name. They did all right. They went all over the county.

I represent a substantial group. We think it is not to protect us but it is also for the protection of the Government's interest.

The most shocking thing that was not brought out clearly was this is not a proposal to locate CIA under one roof. It is a proposal to put them in 12 buildings, 11 of which are in the District and one

which is at Langley. The notice served notice to come back next year and ask for money to put them in the building next year. This will leave them with 11 permanent buildings with employees in the District. They will not be ready to let their contracts until April or May of next year. They have \$5.5 million for planning purposes. I suggest that you do not give them any money until they come in with a project as a whole.

Chairman HAYDEN. Did you make these representations to the House of Representatives?

Mr. FISHER. I did not understand those facts. It was executive session. Those facts were testified to indirectly by the Agency. I did not have a chance to make those points.

The construction costs have gone up 5 percent. The cost of CIA's building has gone up 22 percent with respect to locating at Langley.

#### HISTORY OF BUILDING PLANNING

The story starts in 1954 when Mr. Dulles requested permission from the Dispersal Branch to locate in the District of Columbia where he had thought the Agency should be located. There was quite a fight over dispersal and they compromised. I think it was an unfortunate compromise. When you hit a fork in a road, and you cannot go right or left, then you compromise. They have the drawbacks of getting out of the District. They did not go far enough to be beyond bombing damage.

In April of 1955, the Agency considered about seven sites at that time. They notified the Planning Commission that the Langley site had so many problems connected with it that they would not consider requesting authorization for the parkway to go out to that site. They had abandoned consideration of the Langley site.

That letter was publicized to the effect that Langley was no longer being considered and that they would not request authorization for the parkway. Contrary to that letter, CIA did request authorization for the parkway in executive session. We found that the Langley site was included in the authorization when it was released July 1 of last year.

At that time, before this committee, Mr. Dulles testified that personally he would prefer to build a building in the District of Columbia, but there was a decision of the executive branch which precluded this, primarily because of the traffic conditions involved in the District of Columbia. The executive branch decision was apparently based on its compromise over the acceptance of the compromise regulations.

The committees of Congress, both in the House and Senate, and the Appropriations Committee and the conference committee all stated that they were not precluding or adopting any one particular site. They suggested that further study be made. Rather than turn to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission to which agency, by statute, they should "look to as the central planning agency," they hired private planners and did further studies on their own. They came in to the Planning Commission with a recommended site. The staff report recommended against it. The National Capital Park and Planning Commission in rather a strong report disapproved the Lang-

ley site in December. I say disapproved. That has not been mentioned to you or called to your attention by the Agency. The vote was a close one. Two Government employees, members of the Commission, representing the Agency, failed to support the Langley site.

At the next subsequent meeting, CIA requested reconsideration by the Planning Commission, as they are authorized to do, and those two Government employees were replaced by two other individuals at the next meeting. CIA obtained an affirmative vote. No one else changed their minds. Those two votes were the only two that were changed. They did not wait until they had the report prepared. They came in and said, "We want a vote."

The vote was held and the report and subsequent study were held after that.

CIA has told you that the National Park and Planning Council and the Capital Park and Planning Commission have approved this site by divided votes. They have not told you that it was the unanimous opinion—I believe I am correct in this—the unanimous opinion of the National Capital Park and Planning Regional Council that the Federal Government should assume additional liabilities with regard to roads in the area.

#### RESOLUTION OF REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

I would like to read a resolution by the Regional Planning Council which adopted the resolution approving the site. This one resolution was adopted unanimously. The other was by a split vote of 5 to 3 as Mr. Dulles stated.

It reads as follows:

*Resolved*, The Council request the CIA in conjunction with its request for appropriations ask for authorization and appropriations for the improvements not yet committed which relate to this development described in the report of its Director; mainly, Chain Bridge widening along with Canal Road and Weaver Place improvement; Virginia Route 123 from the Parkway to Chain Bridge; Glebe Road from Lee Highway to Chain Bridge; Parkway to Cabin John Bridge, including the Cabin John Bridge; the George Washington Parkway which is already committed. The Maryland side is not. The outer belt from Route 7 Virginia to United States Route 240 in Maryland.

This was the unanimous request of the body of the roads that ought to be asked for by CIA of this Appropriations Committee if they are going to go to that site. CIA brings you the divided vote of the approval of the Council and fails to mention that the Council considered that CIA should ask for these roads.

Chairman HAYDEN. Could you bring your remarks to a close? We cannot stay here after 5 o'clock and I have a number of other witnesses who would like to be heard.

Mr. FISHER. The National Capital Park and Planning Commission report equally recommended that these roads be built. The road cost was estimated at some \$30 million worth of roads and the required Federal share would be somewhere in the vicinity of \$20 million.

#### VIRGINIA COMMITMENTS

The commitments by Virginia to which Senator Ellender referred as to sewerage for the building itself—the District Engineer responsible for the water supply for the District has said that it is necessary to

obtain necessary comparable commitments regarding the treatment of the development that will be expected. Eighty-seven percent of the CIA employees shown on the map do not own their own homes. They rent and they are a fairly fluid group, and they will move around.

We will have apartment buildings out there and everything else. There are no commitments, no provisions to prevent shopping centers, water pollution of the District water supply, and so on.

I am sorry that time does not permit me to go on. I would like to say that CIA has not indicated to you that they plan to take dedicated park land in part, land that was given to the United States Government, which I believe cannot legally be built upon without express approval of the Congress. This has been kept in the dark although the agency has known about it, and I believe it would be illegal to put the office building on this land in any event.

The District site which Mr. Dulles himself said he would prefer is a site which is now being considered by the Planning Commission in the District. If this committee will hold over the appropriation which is not now needed, I think the problem can be settled to the satisfaction of everyone, and you can throw Bre'r Rabbit into the briar patch where he wants to be anyway.

#### CIA BUILDING LOCATION

#### STATEMENT OF REAR ADM. NEILL PHILLIPS, UNITED STATES NAVY (RETIRED), WASHINGTON, D. C.

##### OPPOSITION TO SITE

Chairman HAYDEN. Our next witness is Mr. Robert L. Farr.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Farr is not here. I have a prepared statement.

My name is Neill Phillips, and I am a resident of Washington, D. C. I am appearing as representative of the Progressive Citizens Association of Georgetown (approximately 900 members) and the Audubon Society of the District of Columbia (approximately 1,200 members in the Greater Washington area). I have also been asked to speak for the Middle States Division of the American Canoe Association.

Your committee has been asked to recommend an appropriation of \$49 million to build a mammoth CIA headquarters (approaching the Pentagon in size) at Langley, Va., on a site with no present access except a winding two-lane State road, and with no sewage facilities whatever.

##### COST OF ROADS, BRIDGES, AND SEWAGE DISPOSAL

The cost of roads, bridges, and sewage disposal would be absolutely colossal. Parenthetically, it might be impossible ever to solve the sewage problem at the Langley site, no matter how much money were spent, as I shall try to show later.

Without these access and sanitary facilities, a CIA headquarters at Langley simply could not function. The price of such improvements should be considered just as much a part of the cost, as the price of the CIA buildings themselves. I submit that it is entirely unrealistic to talk about appropriating \$49 million to build a CIA Langley headquarters when, in fact, the \$49 million is only a part of that cost.

I have studied the arguments and the pages of testimony on why or why not to build CIA at Langley, and I find that the fact fairly jumps out of even those lines of fine print that the pro-Langley plan is very simple:

Get money from Congress to put up the buildings, and then somehow some Government department or agency will just simply have to go to work and figure out how to solve access and sanitation problems and how to get appropriations from Congress to pay for them.

True, there have been tentative plans put forth as to widening roads and bridges and laying sewer mains, with rough estimates of the cost. But even a superficial reading shows them to be vague and generalized, with so many essential details not covered as to be unacceptable in a business sense, particularly when such enormous sums are involved.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it is wrong even to consider CIA's request for \$49 million to build at Langley until and unless CIA also submits a request for appropriations to cover this other utterly essential part of the job.

Now, the above reasoning would hold good even if Langley were an ideal, or even a fairly practicable, site for CIA. But by all fair standards it is a tragically bad site. Believe me, my associates and I have tried to be objective and have tried hard to find some cogent reasons for CIA at Langley but, again, after going over and over the arguments and testimony we can find only two real reasons advanced for it:

(1) It would be pleasant for CIA employees to work in park-like surroundings with a river view.

(2) It would be good for real-estate people who could put up housing developments and shopping centers nearby.

On the other hand, the arguments against CIA at Langley seem overwhelming. I shall list them briefly before I close:

#### SEWAGE

(1) The Potomac is hideously polluted. Federal and State Governments are beginning the Augean task of trying to clean it up. Yet here is a proposal to put a junior Pentagon, with all those thousands of people, on a bluff of the Potomac about one-half mile above the new intake for the District water supply.

True, the local Virginia authorities have committed to provide sewage facilities to the Langley CIA buildings, but so far as I can ascertain, they have shown no plans as to what they are to do with the effluent except to dump it into the Potomac. And apparently there are no plans or ideas at all as to what to do about sewage from all the new communities that would spring up in the CIA area—a problem that can reasonably be expected to grow as big as that of the CIA headquarters itself. And again, remember, all this in the immediate vicinity of the intake of the District water supply.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is little short of a medieval approach to a grave health problem and is unacceptable by any modern standards.

#### BRIDGES

(2) Every day the press carries articles on where and how to build more bridges, or whether to pay the enormous sums required to bore

a tunnel in order to get the population back and forth across the Potomac, or to route traffic around and outside the District. All the proposed plans are drawn up with the idea of just keeping traffic moving for the population as it is at present distributed.

We all know that that alone is a problem of staggering magnitude. Yet, here we have a proposal to compound confusion by putting up a vast CIA complex at a spot in every way situated so as to generate more, much more, cross-river traffic.

#### DISTRICT TRAFFIC

(3) A CIA spokesman before the House Appropriations Committee in June estimated that—

a large part of the 37 percent—  
of CIA traffic to Langley—

would find the Key Bridge probably more convenient than Chain Bridge or Memorial Bridge.

If you go to either end of Chain Bridge, Virginia or Georgetown, at the rush hour this afternoon and see the pandemonium that exists, and then try to picture what it would be like with "a large part of the 37 percent" of CIA traffic trying to get back and forth, I believe you will be appalled.

No plans that I know of have been made to take care of this increased traffic in the narrow environs of the Georgetown end of Chain Bridge, and no such plans could be carried out without destroying much of Georgetown's present character and present property values.

A similar, or perhaps worse, situation would exist at Chain Bridge which it is proposed to widen. Approaches are narrow and there are numerous dead ends. True, the National Capital Regional Planning Commission proposes improvements to Canal Road and Weaver Place to serve Chain Bridge, at an estimated cost of \$900,000.

I believe this estimate far too low for the size of the job. It is also obvious that it does not take into account—as there is no account taken in the case of Key Bridge—of the change in traffic patterns all over that part of the District of Columbia within 2 or 3 miles of Key and Chain Bridges that would result from the traffic flow engendered by a huge CIA complex at Langley.

#### IMPACT ON THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

(4) This comprehensive plan was set up by the National and the Regional Capital Planning Commissions to provide for orderly development of the Nation's Capital and its environs. Putting CIA at Langley cuts directly across this plan and flouts its basic concepts, as is plainly shown on page 2 of the National Capital Planning Commission's report of March 2, 1956, to which I fully invite your attention.

#### POTENTIAL PARK LAND

(5) The proposed site of CIA at Langley is on a tract of land now under the Bureau of Public Roads, which has indicated it does not need it.

If there were no CIA at Langley, this tract would almost certainly become park land—for which it is ideally suited—in conjunction with the George Washington Memorial Highway, since it could be occupied as such under the Capper-Crampton Act. The tract is unique in being so near a big city and yet possessing so many natural blessings.

There are great stands of hardwoods, groves of flowering trees and bushes, abundant wild flowers and ferns, many of them rare species, beautiful river views and teeming bird and animal life.

In conjunction with the George Washington Memorial Highway it could be made into a really fabulous park accessible to all the people. Yet, it is proposed to shut it off for one Government agency and forever destroy much of its unspoiled character with huge building projects.

This tragic deed would run counter to the aims of every conservation organization in the country and would be an official negation by the United States Government of every tenet of modern sociological thinking which stresses the need of increasing open spaces for increasing population.

#### OTHER LOCATIONS FOR CIA

(6) I shall not take up any more of your time other than to invite attention to the several other proposed locations for CIA, in the northwest section, in the new southwest redevelopment area, in the vicinity of Alexandria and in the vicinity of the National Training School for Boys; sites where most, if not all, of the deeply objectionable features of the Langley site do not exist.

This matter of alternative sites has been covered in cogent detail by the recommendations submitted to CIA by the Federal City Council.

Mr. Chairman, I can sum up my regrettably long testimony in a few words:

This plan of CIA at Langley is indigestible and uncooked. Yet it has the most serious potential impact on the entire District of Columbia area. As hardheaded but, I believe, public-spirited citizens and taxpayers, we urgently request that you recommend that appropriations be held up until the present fuzzy picture is brought into a reasonable focus justifying the outpouring of billions of dollars for CIA at Langley.

Senator DWORSIAK. I do not think you need to worry about sewage disposal. That would be classified and you would not know where it went anyway.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I could claim it is in my drinking water.

#### CIA BUILDING LOCATION

#### STATEMENT OF R. M. SMITH

#### SUPPORT FOR LANGLEY, VA., SITE

Mr. SMITH. I will make this very brief, Mr. Chairman; I would just like to leave this map around with the members of the committee.

I got a little confused myself at hearing all of these difficulties that face Langley.

I live at Langley, Va., and I thought I knew all about it. I run a weekly newspaper out there. I know this site and cannot see hardly

any of these problems about which they speak. One speaker got as high as \$20 million on sewage. At least that was sent out in a letter.

Of the county of Fairfax at this moment, there is cash in the bank from a \$20-million bond issue that they issued over a year ago, and they have set that aside to take care of CIA. They have had the engineers figure out how they are going to do it and they have committed themselves definitely to give that sewerage. They are taking care of the factors above the outlet of the District water supply, so I just do not see where, as far as the Government is concerned, the sewage comes in.

On the roads, I believe Mr. Fisher or someone was saying something about many multimillions of dollars for roads. It is going to take some roads, but the main part is taken care of.

In short, the main one required is the extension of the boulevard which is part of this bill, so we know we have that. Under the new highway bill that was just passed, the belt highway around Washington which crosses on Cabin John Bridge just above Langley has been made top priority by the State of Virginia under its urban roads national program.

I understand the Maryland part has been under consideration and that there was a big-headline article in the Post a few weeks ago by the Maryland Parks Commission roadman saying that they expected to get started this year.

Chairman HAYDEN. Do you think the new highway takes care of the road problem?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir; we have shown on this map the various roads from Chain Bridge.

Chairman HAYDEN. The map cannot be included in the record but the printed text which accompanies it may be included in the record. (The information referred to follows:)

#### FACTS AND LOGIC POINT TO LANGLEY FOR THE CIA

"It seems clear that, all things considered, the CIA would be better able to perform its functions from this location than from others under consideration, and this factor should, I believe, be controlling."—Letter from the Director of the CIA, Mr. Allen Dulles, to the United States Senate Appropriations Subcommittee.

Look at the map above and you see why this 741-acre tract of Government-owned land at Langley, in Fairfax County, Va., is the right location for permanent headquarters of the CIA. Let's weigh these facts:

1. Tucked away in this huge acreage, the CIA will not disrupt the life of any community. It will not impose excessive traffic on either Washington or any suburban town. It will use only a small part of the big tract, and make possible the preservation of the rest in the natural charm we wish to see.

2. At this Langley site the CIA will be just across the Potomac from Northwest Washington and adjoining Maryland communities—the area where two-thirds of CIA employees are reported to live. It will be more accessible to the majority than their present offices in downtown Washington—no need for any CIA employee to uproot his family from present living quarters.

3. Everybody who drives a car in Washington will benefit by the choice of Langley for the CIA, because its selection will relieve downtown Washington of the burden of several thousand vehicles used by CIA employees each morning and evening. If any Virginia site south of the Pentagon were chosen, it would mean that the great majority of CIA employees would have to drive through the already overcrowded downtown Washington traffic and add to the congestion.

4. Adequate roads for the Langley site are assured. Congress has already appropriated \$2,500,000 to start extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway to Langley if that site is chosen by CIA. Virginia has pledged in writing to dual-lane Chain Bridge Road (Route 123) from Langley to its junction



with the extended parkway by the time the CIA buildings would be completed. Money has already been appropriated to extend and grade Canal Road from Chain Bridge to the Cabin John Bridge site. Other scheduled improvements include the belt highway, with its Cabin John Bridge adjacent to the Langley site, as shown on the above map.

5. Adequate water is pledged in writing by the city of Falls Church, which is at the present time having the Army engineers install a 36-inch supply main in the Little Falls Dam, almost immediately adjacent to the Langley site, as a direct connection with Dalecarlia Reservoir.

6. Adequate sewers are pledged in writing by Fairfax County to be ready by the time the CIA Building can be completed, and funds are available from the county's \$20 million sewer bonds.

7. CIA will be welcomed to Langley not only by the great majority of local residents, but also by Fairfax County as a whole. The residents of the only area which the Fairfax County Planning Commission designates as directly affected by CIA, who own over 85 percent of the land, signed a statement for the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee that they did not object to the move. Several thousand other residents have filed a similar statement with the National Capital Planning Commission. Both the Democratic and the Republican candidates for Dranesville supervisor, 80 percent of whose constituents live near the Langley site, have publicly favored CIA as their neighbor.

8. Others favoring the Langley site are the Fairfax County Planning Commission; the chairman of the Fairfax County Park Authority; the Fairfax County member of the National Capital Regional Planning Council; the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce; Mayor Herman Fink, of Falls Church; the Forestville Grange; the Home and Community Club of Forestville; and other groups.

The advantages of the Langley site for CIA are admirably summed up in the following excerpt from Director Allen Dulles' letter to the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee:

"In view of Langley's easier accessibility to Agency employees, comparable accessibility to other Government agencies, far better security, and capacity for expansion if necessary, it is considered by us to be the best of those sites under consideration."

Money is ready to extend beautiful George Washington Memorial Parkway upstream from Key Bridge and approaching Fairfax County.

Choice of the Langley site for CIA will speed the extension of this splendid parkway, long overdue as a quick route for travel in this area.

Congress has voted \$2.5 million to begin this extension and approved \$6 million more for its completion to the Langley site, if chosen by CIA. Get CIA at Langley and you get the parkway.

McLEAN-LANGLEY CITIZENS FOR THE CIA,  
McLEAN, VA.,  
RICHARD M. SMITH, *Chairman*.

#### TRAFFIC FLOW

Mr. SMITH. When you look at that road map and see the boulevard and the extension up the river and see the Belt Highway which is now immediately in the picture, and you see the extension of the Canal Road on the District side which they are grading right this minute from Canal Road up to Cabin John, plus now the Constitution Avenue additional bridge, it seems that the flow of the employee traffic on the boulevard and up to the boulevard down on the Maryland and Virginia sides is just about as simple as it could possibly be, and it is largely not in the flow of the present traffic.

There is a good deal of talk about hurting the neighborhood. The county supervisors have just voted last week to put in a 1-acre zoning restriction that you see around the Langley tract. In fact, it goes almost up to the 5-mile area in which Mr. Fisher lives. In fact, it goes almost up to his place. The county realizes itself that they are going to have to hold the zoning picture. They are putting in this

1-acre minimum all around the site, and there is no commercial zoning allowed in it at all. In fact, CIA has helped our zoning to be stronger rather than hurting it.

PROVISIONS FOR UTILITIES

With respect to the water, the Government does not take care of it. The city of Falls Church is running a 36-inch main right now across Little Falls Dam which I would say is a quarter of a mile below the site, and they have guaranteed to give the site the water.

The electric company has given assurance of electricity and the telephone company has given its assurance of service.

So far as the Government is concerned, I can see where they have to do absolutely nothing at all except what is in the natural appropriation, the building plus the \$8 million for the boulevard extension.

Senator DWORSHAK. Where will they get their water.

Mr. SMITH. They will get it from Dalecarlia. Falls Church is connected to Dalecarlia.

Senator DWORSHAK. Is there an adequate supply of water available to take care of any potential needs?

Mr. SMITH. At Dalecarlia, there is. That is the full District supply, and at least Falls Church has been assured of that.

Senator DWORSHAK. This would be an added burden upon the water supply.

Mr. SMITH. It would be for that building, but it would be District water even if you had it right here.

Senator DWORSHAK. I do not want to put it in the District. I do not want to put it anywhere.

Mr. SMITH. When I leave here, I will be at my home in 20 minutes even during this traffic hour, so Mr. Addison and the people who think we are moving all of the employees away, losing the trade for the city—they have nothing to worry about. We trade in the city. It is the closest place to trade.

Senator ELLENDER. You folks would not do what the District is doing, making the people from all over the United States run the District.

We put up \$20 million a year, and I hope if we put up that structure at Langley that the people around there will not, in time, make us contribute toward helping to run the government of Langley or that locality.

Mr. SMITH. I am sure they will not. We have been paying our own way all along and we expect to continue to do so.

Senator ELLENDER. But the Congress has, too, up to some time, but we have so many Federal buildings here that are not on the tax rolls that the people all over the country are contributing \$20 million toward the payment to operate the Federal Government here.

Chairman HAYDEN. Thank you for your statement.

CIA BUILDING LOCATION

STATEMENT OF WALLACE CARPER

SUPPORT FOR LANGLEY, VA., LOCATION

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Wallace Carper. I am an ex-member of the county board of supervisors, having served for 20 years, and I was its chairman for 16 years.

I think I am in a position and have been for the past great many years to say and to inform you of the general sentiment in our area. I hear very few complaints about it and I have heard very few arguments all during the time it was being so hotly discussed. I do not have much to say because I didn't know this meeting was coming up until just a late hour, and I did not prepare any statement.

However, I can confirm what has been said by Mr. Smith and Congressman Broyhill.

I think as far as the utilities are concerned, they have all been taken care of.

I think these officials have dealt as fairly as they could with the county. I think the poll which Mr. Broyhill took is just about as democratic as anything can be. By being democratic, that is how he got elected.

The project, it was found, was favored by 1,789 and it was opposed by 517. All of this property is in that district. That is a poll from the people in that district and the people who would be affected by it.

If there are any questions that I can answer, I would be very glad to do so.

Chairman HAYDEN. Thank you very much.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSIONS

LETTER FROM SENATOR POTTER ON SEA LAMPREY PROGRAM

Chairman HAYDEN. I will file for the record a letter I received from Senator Potter urging allowance of the budget estimate of \$620,000 requested for the sea lamprey research and control program.

(The communication referred to follows:)

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,  
July 6, 1956.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,  
*Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Prior to leaving for Europe on official business, I wish to register my full support of the 1957 supplemental budget request of the Department of State for \$620,000 in connection with the International Fisheries Commissions.

As you know, these funds are necessary to inaugurate the international sea lamprey research and control program under the Great Lakes Fishery Commission on July 1, 1956. The problem of eradicating the sea lamprey is of compelling urgency. This eel-like predator has destroyed the supply of trout and whitefish in Lakes Huron and Michigan. By 1955 this menace had succeeded in reducing the Lake Michigan trout catch by about 2 million pounds a year, and

now threatens the very existence of Superior trout and whitefish fisheries. This "vampire eel" costs United States and Canadian fishermen more than \$5 million each year in trout alone.

The requested funds will bring about coordinated research efforts between Canada and the United States to eliminate the sea lamprey and to find solutions to the numerous problems which are detrimental to the fishing industry. As a result, the cost to the United States to accomplish these highly desirable and necessary objectives will be less in the future than in the past. Because of the cooperative effort with Canada, it will be possible for us to accomplish much more for a smaller amount of money than has been required heretofore.

I respectfully urge our committee to allow the budget request of the Department of State in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. POTTER.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WEATHER CONTROL

Chairman HAYDEN. At this point, the formal appeal letter from the Advisory Committee on Weather Control will be inserted in the record. (The letter referred to follows:)

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WEATHER CONTROL,  
Washington, D. C., July 9, 1956.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,  
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: There is enclosed the appeal to your committee from the action of the House and its Appropriations Committee in completely denying the estimate of \$350,000 for financing the activities of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control during fiscal year 1957.

At page 6 of House Report No. 2638 the House Appropriations Committee states that it feels that there is serious question as to whether or not the Advisory Committee's continuation is necessary, and that legislation authorizing its extension has not as yet been approved. In this connection, please note that both Houses of Congress and their respective legislative committee had already acted unanimously in favor of the legislation authorizing the extension of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control at the time the committee's report was issued and the President signed this bill, S. 2913, on July 9, 1956.

The enclosed justification for the requested amendment to H. R. 12138 does not reiterate the details of the full justification for the supplemental estimate of appropriation for fiscal year 1957, already presented in hearings before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. It is not our intention to burden either your committee or the Senate and House conferees with reconsideration of the detailed reasons for the appropriation requests they have already considered. The appeal of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control is addressed only to a summary of the reasons why we will not be able to complete our statutory mission by July 30, 1956, and, therefore, why it is necessary to ask for the restoration of the full appropriation request to complete the assignment in the additional 2 years already granted by the Congress and approved by the President.

This Committee's program to evaluate weather modification activities might well develop into a significant contribution to the solution of the serious water resources problems and the suppression of hail and lightning in many States of the Nation. It has the support of the administration, all the interested agencies and the vitally concerned water users. My opinion is that it would be a major loss to our country if the continuity and completion of the work of this Committee were permitted to cease for lack of adequate appropriations.

Very sincerely yours,

HOWARD T. ORVILLE, *Chairman*.

AMENDMENT REQUESTED

On page 4, line 14, insert:

"INDEPENDENT OFFICES

"ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WEATHER CONTROL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

*"For necessary expenses of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control, established by the Act of August 13, 1953 (67 Stat. 559), as amended, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$350,000."*

HOUSE REPORT

*"Salaries and expenses.—The committee has denied the estimate of \$350,000 for this activity, feeling that serious question exists as to whether or not its continuation is necessary. In addition, legislation authorizing extension of the Advisory Committee has not as yet been approved."*

JUSTIFICATION

*Authorization*

Legislation authorizing the extension of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control for another 2 years was approved without dissent by the legislative committees of both Houses of Congress (S. Rept. No. 1866 and H. Rept. No. 2424), and passed by both the Senate and House unanimously. The final favorable action by the House on S. 2913 was taken on July 2 prior to the issuance of the report by the House Appropriations Committee, and the President signed the bill into law on July 9, 1956.

*Legislative History*

The Advisory Committee on Weather Control was established after lengthy congressional hearings between 1951 and 1953 demonstrated that farmers, ranchers, electric utilities, municipalities, and other water users were annually expending 3 to 5 million dollars on weather modification activities covering 10 percent of the land area of the Nation and, also, that there were no existing private or public agencies willing or able to assume the responsibility of impartially evaluating these weather modification operations to find out if they were actually producing favorable results. The existing agencies were primarily concerned with weather forecasting, pure and basic research in cloud physics or commercial cloud seeding.

*Staffing difficulties*

The act creating this Committee was approved August 13, 1953; funds were not appropriated until almost a year later in July 1954; and the Committee was not able to assemble a qualified scientific staff for such a small temporary agency until January 1955. The small staff of 15 scientific and administrative employees has had only about a year and a half to conduct evaluations of weather modification activities. Assembling this staff was made possible only by obtaining competent technical personnel on reimbursable loan from the permanent agencies. The work of this small temporary group of employees is supported by the technical and scientific advice and assistance of consultants from private industry and the various universities and foundations.

*Status of evaluations*

The Committee's statistical evaluations show that cloud-seeding operations during the cooler and moist seasons of the year in the mountainous areas of the Pacific Coast States produced average increases in precipitation ranging from 9 to 17 percent above what was to be expected. The Committee's physical evaluations, designed to ascertain if there is physical evidence to support its statistical evaluations, thus far, appear to have established that the silver iodide used for cloud seeding does in fact get up into the clouds under similar conditions present in the west coast cloud-seeding operations which were statistically evaluated.

*Inability to apply present incomplete evaluations to all States*

The Committee cannot, at this time, report to the President and the Congress whether the same economically important results found in the west coast States can be applied to the varied water-resources problems in other States of the

Nation and under other physical circumstances. In order to do so it must have the time and the money to statistically and physically evaluate weather modification activities in the mountainous areas of about 24 other States and the flat country of the remaining States.

*Importance of both physical and statistical evaluation programs*

House Report No. 603 and Senate Report No. 512 on fiscal year 1956 appropriations specifically recognized the need for the physical evaluation program as well as the statistical evaluation program of the Committee. Approximately one-half of this year's total request of \$350,000 is to be devoted respectively to the statistical evaluation program and the physical evaluation program.

*Funds required to complete assignment*

The Committee will be able to maintain the continuity of its data collection and analysis and complete evaluations in the remaining major portion of the Nation only if the full amount of this year's budget request is appropriated. Similarly, the full amount of the appropriation request will permit the Committee to further investigate the feasibility of cloud-seeding activities to suppress hail and inhibit lightning fires in the Nation's forests.

*Appropriation summary*

Upon the completion of these studies and evaluations, the Committee will make a final report to the Congress at the earliest practicable date and not later than June 30, 1958, covering the entire country and all the scientific, economic, and legal aspects of weather modification. The Committee's appropriations for the fiscal years 1955 and 1956 were \$120,000 and \$275,000, respectively. The budget request for the Committee for this fiscal year, 1957, is \$350,000. It is anticipated that the fiscal year 1958 budget request will be somewhat lower than the one for this year.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

(See p. 475.)

Chairman HAYDEN. I will insert the table referred to by Mr. Streibert, Director of the United States Information Agency, in his opening statement.

(The matter referred to follows:)

PRESIDENT'S SPECIAL INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM (NO-YEAR APPROPRIATION)

SUMMARY TABLES

TABLE I.—Allocation of prior appropriations and fiscal year 1957 supplemental request: Effect of House committee action

By action agency	Appropriated, fiscal year 1955	Appropriated, fiscal year 1956	Total appropriations to date	Supplemental request, fiscal year 1957	House committee action	Decrease
Department of State.....	\$2,250,000	\$2,050,000	\$4,300,000	\$2,700,000	\$2,000,000	—\$700,000
Department of Commerce.....	2,592,456	2,760,000	5,352,456	1,598,400	2,687,400	—3,300,000
U. S. Information Agency.....	157,544	190,000	347,544	312,600	-----	—312,600
Total appropriation.....	5,000,000	5,000,000	10,000,000	9,000,000	4,687,400	—4,312,600

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$67,000 for activities of the Department of Labor.

TABLE 2.—Status of appropriations as of June 30, 1956

By action agency	Total allocations	Obligations			Estimated unobligated balance
		1955 actual	1956 estimate	Cumulative total	
Department of State.....	\$4,300,000	\$1,820,403	\$2,433,583	\$4,253,986	\$46,014
Department of Commerce.....	5,352,456	1,769,421	3,230,579	5,000,000	352,456
U. S. Information Agency.....	347,544	79,455	159,845	239,300	108,244
Total.....	10,000,000	3,669,279	5,824,007	9,493,286	506,714

#### TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Chairman HAYDEN. I have received a letter from Acting Secretary of the Treasury W. Randolph Burgess relating to his appearance before the committee on Thursday, July 5. The letter will be placed in the record.

(The letter referred to follows:)

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,  
Washington, July 12, 1956.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,  
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to H. R. 12138, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, which was reported by the House Appropriations Committee on July 6, 1956. Of the 4 Treasury items contained therein, 2 were recommended for approval in the full amount of the estimates and the remaining 2 for the Division of Disbursement and the Internal Revenue Service were recommended for reduction in the amounts of \$100,000 and \$380,000, respectively.

The items in which reductions in the estimates were recommended are related to each other, since both are concerned with the refund of gasoline taxes to farmers under the provisions of Public Law No. 466 of this Congress. In the case of each of these estimates, the budget request was founded upon an estimated volume of \$5 million anticipated refunds per year. In reducing the amount requested, the House Appropriations Committee, in its report accompanying the bill, indicated that it was of the opinion that the estimated number of claims indicated would not materialize.

In connection with the above, it should be noted that the estimates referred to were based upon the best information available in this Department. The amounts of the estimates were arrived at through the exercise of our best judgment based upon this information. It now appears that the House Appropriations Committee, utilizing information available to it, has arrived at a different judgment. Only time and actual experience will determine which judgment was more nearly correct.

Under the circumstances, since we have no new evidence bearing on the matter other than that presented to the House committee, please be advised that no protest will be made of the proposed reductions in these two items and that we are willing to abide by the judgment of the House Appropriations Committee in this matter. The above decision should be accepted, however, with the understanding that if the original volume estimates hold up in actual experience, it may be necessary to return at a later date for further consideration of additional funds.

Yours very truly,

W. RANDOLPH BURGESS,  
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

#### CIA BUILDING LOCATION

Chairman HAYDEN. I have received a report regarding the status of land acquisition in connection with the CIA building location which will be placed in the record.

(The report referred to follows:)

STATUS OF LAND ACQUISITION

(See p. 737)

1. As background information on the actual transfer of jurisdiction for the purposes of construction of the building, it should be noted that there are currently two agencies of the executive branch which have jurisdiction over the site in question.

(a) The National Park Service has jurisdiction over a 60-foot strip of land running through the site originally intended to provide access to the George Washington Memorial Parkway for the benefit of the owners of the Leiter estate. The Government eventually acquired title to the entire eLeter estate, thus extinguishing the easement. The Park Service, in a letter to this Agency of May 18, 1956, has stated:

"This service will declare the land involved as excess \* \* \* as soon as a metes and bounds declaration is prepared by the Bureau of Public Roads and clearance has been secured from the National Capital Planning Commission."

(b) The principal portion of the land concerned is under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Public Roads, which has stated, in a letter dated February 21, 1955, that:

"\* \* \* the Bureau agrees to the release for use by your Agency of approximately 100 acres of the tract contingent upon an understanding with respect to the required survey, the provision of a dividing fence, and other pertinent considerations."

Subsequently, in a letter of October 3, 1955, the Bureau increased the area to 140 acres.

2. Discussions have been held with the General Services Administration and arrangements have been generally agreed upon for transfer of jurisdiction of the land concerned to the Agency in accordance with procedures as prescribed by law.

3. With respect to the 60-foot strip of land currently under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, the Service has applied to the National Capital Planning Commission for clearance of their proposed action in declaring the land excess to Park Service needs. This is in accord with current Park Service practices.

4. At the present time, the National Capital Planning Commission staff has sent forward mailed ballots to each of the members of the Commission requesting an expression of their views. As you are aware, however, the National Capital Planning Commission has already approved the location of our building on the Langley site.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

LETTER ON AMENDMENTS REQUESTED

Chairman HAYDEN. I have received a letter from the President of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners on the amendments requested to the supplemental appropriation bill for 1957. This letter will be placed in the record.

(The communication follows:)

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,  
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,  
Washington, D. C., July 11, 1956.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,  
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: Subsequent to the hearings on July 5, 1956, before your committee on District of Columbia items included in the supplemental bill, 1957, the House reported the bill with reductions amounting to \$2,033,706. The Commissioners have examined the items deleted by the House and respectfully request favorable consideration by the Senate of the following restorations:



#### FEDERAL PAYMENT

*Restoration of \$3 million—\$23 million authorized by the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1956*

The District of Columbia Revenue Acts of 1954 and 1956 contemplated joint participation between the Federal Government and the District government. By virtue of these acts the local taxpayers assume an additional tax burden of \$24 million and the Federal Government \$13.3 million. Any reduction in the Federal payment is obviously unfair to the District of Columbia residents. Attention is invited to the House committee reports for 1956 and 1957. In 1956 the committee stated as follows: "Sound fiscal management provides for the establishment of budget reserves." In reporting the 1957 bill, the committee stated: "If it were to approve the budget estimate the committee would be in the position of recommending an appropriation of Federal funds to create a surplus in the general fund of the District of Columbia." The Commissioners feel that the Federal payment should not in any way be associated with the amount of unappropriated surplus that might be available, and respectfully urge restoration of the full \$3 million Federal payment.

#### OPERATING EXPENSES

*Department of General Administration, \$8,990*

This request pertains to a GS-13 accountant to be used in installing modern accounting systems for the District of Columbia government. Lack of modern accounting systems is seriously hampering management control, and has been criticized repeatedly by the General Accounting Office.

*Department of Occupations and Professions, \$3,200*

This request will provide one additional clerk, GS-3, to assist in keeping up with the ever-increasing workload of this Department, which regulates the licensing of 20 different occupations and professions. Without this additional clerk the workload of this Department will become progressively delinquent.

*Metropolitan Police Department, \$136,200 (of which \$17,000 shall be payable from the highway fund)*

The amount requested to be restored is composed of \$7,200 for the purchase of 6 automobiles, and \$149,000 for additional policemen. In the case of the automobiles, these additional cars are required so that the police department can operate in an efficient, economical manner. Lack of these additional vehicles causes lost time on the part of police officers while they wait for repairs and also necessitates uneconomical types of vehicle repair work. The amount for policemen would result in 28 additional man-years of employment. Although the recruitment could possibly be delayed to make up this reduction, restoration would be advantageous inasmuch as the extra money could be used to employ officers for an additional workday each week and thereby prevent crime.

*Courts, \$19,600*

The Central Violations Bureau for which \$19,600 restoration is recommended, consists of 14 employees. The 6 employees involved in this amount would, it is estimated, provide \$200,000 additional revenue to the District of Columbia. Without these employees the workload would lag and traffic law enforcement will be seriously impeded.

*Department of Public Health, \$140,500*

This proposed amendment involves \$126,000 for increased salary of interns and residents, and \$14,500 for first-aid assistants for ambulance service. The Commissioners are empowered by law to fix rates of interns and resident physicians, and have done so. Failure to provide appropriation will not only result in a morale situation but will certainly interfere very materially with recruitment for fiscal year 1958, which starts in September 1956 and must be completed in February 1957.

The Commissioners deem it necessary to have first-aid assistants in the ambulance service, thereby relieving interns for more important duties in District of Columbia General Hospital. Other cities are now doing this same thing because of the shortage of interns.

*National Guard, \$4,100*

Restoration is requested to bring the salary of the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard up to \$11,600. The Commissioners feel that

the full amount of this salary should be paid the commanding general notwithstanding his retirement pay. It is the Commissioners' understanding that the commanding general receives \$6,513 per annum retirement pay and that this amount can be retained by him under the law in addition to the salary proposed by the Commissioners. A salary of less than \$11,600 will make it difficult, if not impossible, to recruit a qualified person for this duty when the present incumbent's term expires.

## CAPITAL OUTLAY

## GENERAL FUND

*Fire boat, \$100,000*

The Commissioners deem it not desirable to repair the present fire boat. The cost will be \$60,000 for the present inadequate boat. They also consider it inadvisable to attempt to equip a small police patrol boat, which is designed for patrol purposes only. Attention is invited to the fact that there is always the possibility of water catastrophes necessitating fire-fighting equipment. The river traffic is becoming increasingly heavy and the Commissioners would not want to assume responsibility for not calling attention to the fact that they consider this to be a very vital item, as far as the protection of life and property is concerned.

*Site of repair shop and engine house No. 7, \$25,000*

This item is required to purchase a site for these activities, which price was set by the Redevelopment Land Agency. Failure to obtain this site in the current fiscal year will mean a delay of 1 year in the construction.

*Children's Center, detention unit, \$469,900*

The House committee in their report stated that the cost of this building was excessive and suggested that the plans be revised with the objective of bringing this cost estimate in line with the other projects at the Children's Center. Actually, this project is entirely different from other buildings at the center inasmuch as it is to care for defective delinquents which require almost a separate institution with a security system. We have reexamined the cost estimate and feel that it is as low as these conditions permit.

*Youth Correctional Center, \$550,000*

The House committee stated that this deletion resulted from the fact that there was \$600,000 still available from last year. This currently available amount was for the purpose of installing utilities for this center. However, after the plans were almost completed, it was determined that it would be more economical to hold this money and enter into one contract for the entire center. If the \$550,000 is not restored, it will mean delay in the construction of a unit of the center and a probable increase in the cost of the deferred unit. If restoration is approved, construction could start in November.

*Sanitary sewers, \$100,000*

The Commissioners are not advised as to the reason for the \$100,000 reduction in the sanitary sewer works program. Failure to obtain this appropriation will result in the delay of the very important pollution abatement program.

## FINANCIAL STATUS, GENERAL FUND

If the Senate restores the items requested that are payable from the general fund the financial status will be as follows:

Surplus in bill as passed the House (no reserve for contingencies)	+ \$241, 880
Surplus in bill with Senate amendments requested (\$3,000,000 Federal payment and \$1,000,000 reserve for contingencies)	+1, 276, 390
Surplus in bill with Senate amendments requested (\$2,000,000 Federal payment and \$1,000,000 reserve for contingencies)	+ 276, 390
Surplus in bill with Senate amendments requested (\$1,000,000 Federal payment and no reserve)	+ 276, 390
Deficit in bill with Senate amendments requested (no increased Federal payment and no reserve)	- 723, 690

There is attached a summary of the reductions made by the House and the restorations recommended by the Commissioners to this committee.

The Commissioners will greatly appreciate your favorable consideration of these requests.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. McLAUGHLIN,  
 President, Board of Commissioners,  
 of District of Columbia.

The following items have been approved by the Commissioners for restoration in supplemental bill, 1957:

FEDERAL PAYMENT

It is recommended that the additional amount of \$3 million authorized by the Revenue Act of 1956, be requested.

Operating expenses (by departments)

Department	Reduction	Restoration recommended
Department of General Administration:		
Accounting.....	\$8,990	\$8,990
Assessing.....	5,440	
Processing.....	17,570	
Department of Occupations and Professions.....	3,200	3,200
Metropolitan Police (\$17,000 payable from the highway fund).....	136,200	136,200
Courts:		
Central Violations Bureau.....	19,600	19,600
Domestic relations.....	25,150	
Department of Public Health:		
Dental Health Service.....	9,415	
Mental Health Service.....	16,254	
Ringworm control.....	4,785	
Legal Psychiatric Service.....	13,756	
Coordinated dental program.....	30,000	
Salary increase for interns and residents.....	120,000	120,000
First-aid assistants for Ambulance Service.....	14,500	14,500
Department of Vehicles and Traffic.....	3,175	
National Guard.....	4,100	4,100
Total.....	438,135	312,590

The above recommended restorations are chargeable to the general fund with the exception of \$17,000 payable from the highway fund.

Capital outlay (by items)

Project	Reductions			Restoration recommended		
	Total	1957	1958	Total	1957	1958
General fund:						
Fire boat.....	\$100,000	\$100,000		\$100,000	\$100,000	
Site, repair shop and engine house No. 7.....	25,000	25,000		25,000	25,000	
Operating suite, District of Columbia General Hospital.....	8,000		\$8,000			
Glenn Dale Hospital:						
Medical laboratory expenses.....	77,000	77,000				
Expansion surgical facilities.....	94,000	94,000				
Children's Center, detention unit.....	469,900	269,900	200,000	469,900	269,900	\$200,000
Junior Village, permanent improvements.....	28,000	28,000				
Recreation Department.....	46,671	46,671				
Youth Correctional Center.....	550,000	275,000	275,000	550,000	275,000	275,000
Stormwater sewers.....	97,000	97,000				
Total, general fund.....	1,495,571	1,012,571	483,000	1,144,900	669,900	475,000
Sanitary sewerage works fund: Sanitary sewers.....	100,000		100,000	100,000		100,000
Total.....	1,595,571	1,012,571	583,000	1,244,900	669,900	575,000

NOTE.—If the above capital outlay items are approved, additional language will be required.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Chairman HAYDEN. I have received an appeal letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, which will be placed in the record.  
(The letter referred to follows:)

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,  
Washington, D. C., July 12, 1956.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Independent Offices and General Government  
Matters, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

My DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In your consideration of chapter V of H. R. 12138 there are two items dealing with the proposed 1957 supplemental appropriation for Bureau of the Budget, salaries and expenses, which I wish to call to your attention:

(1) Page 15, line 9, change "\$375,000" to "\$405,000."

The President in transmitting to the Speaker of the House of Representatives the supplemental appropriation request for fiscal year 1957 for the Bureau of the Budget stated that:

"\* \* \* the proposed appropriation represents a necessary step in carrying out \* \* \* further improvements in executive branch budgeting, accounting, and management \* \* \* Expansion of the staff resources of the Bureau is needed in order that the Bureau may provide, on my behalf, more active central leadership in the advancement of administration in the executive agencies."

To carry out this program aimed at further improvement in executive branch budgeting, accounting, and management, a supplemental appropriation of \$405,000 for fiscal year 1957 for the Bureau of the Budget was requested. This was considered the minimum amount required to support the commencement of a modest program which would permit the Bureau to accelerate its activities in the fields of budgeting, accounting, and management. It was estimated that the sum of \$405,000 would provide sufficient funds to engage 15 additional accountants and 15 additional management specialists and to finance required supporting services.

It is desirable to stress at this point that in asking restoration of the requested \$405,000 as the minimum essential for the financing of the planned program, emphasis should be placed on the fact that this amount is requested to permit the Bureau (1) to assist the agencies in working out sound and comprehensive accounting systems, with emphasis on support of budgeting activities, and (2) to effect, further improvement of agency management, especially by reviews or surveys, which will serve to locate areas of inefficiency and overstaffing. These improvements should be effected and a basis for sound administrative control established at the earliest possible date.

(2) Page 15, line 12, after "\$110,000", change the period to a comma and add the following: "the limitation thereunder on the amount available for services as authorized by the Act of August 2, 1946, is increased from '\$20,000' to '\$25,000' and the maximum per diem rate for individuals serving pursuant to said Act is increased from '\$50' to '\$75'."

In planning this program of improvement in agency budgeting, accounting, and management, it was appreciated that with the small additional staff requested, full-time staff specialists in all required phases could not be supported within the limitation of the requested amount of \$405,000. Thus an increase in the amount of funds which the Bureau could spend for consultants and experts was requested. It appears to me that the restoration of the requested increase of \$5,000 in the total amount which the Bureau can expend for the services of consultants and experts under this appropriation is desirable and essential. This is true not only for proper effectuation of the planned budgeting, accounting, and management improvement program but also from the point of view of efficient staff utilization.

The language which was proposed for the 1957 supplemental appropriation provided authority to permit employment of consultants at rates not to exceed \$75 per day, an increase over the presently authorized \$50-per-day rate. This increase was proposed in order to permit more adequate compensation for consultants selected from among outstanding individuals in business and technical fields who are customarily reimbursed at rates higher than can now be paid. The Congress has in other instances authorized rates higher than \$50 per day, par-

ticularly for those agencies and activities having frequent need for technical consultants.

The programs to be financed from this appropriation are of such a nature that they will require the services of highly qualified technical experts competent to advise upon the solution of complex problems of budgeting, accounting, and management. Restoration of the requested authority to employ consultants under the Bureau of the Budget "Salaries and expenses" appropriation at rates not to exceed \$75 per day is therefore respectfully requested. This authority should be helpful in bringing about more effective utilization of the appropriation.

Sincerely yours,

PERCIVAL BRUNDAGE, *Director.*

# MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

(See p. 637)

Chairman HAYDEN. The following is a list of projects included in the 1957 authorization and in the funding program, but not included in the House action, and also a list of projects approved for funding in 1956 and prior years by the Congress but not included in the House action. This tabulation will be inserted in the record at this point.  
(The matter referred to follows:)

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

*Projects included in the 1957 military construction authorization bill, H. R. 9893, not approved for funding in fiscal year 1957 by action of H. Rept. 2638 on H. R. 12138, restoration to funding program requested*

### SHIPYARD FACILITIES, CONTINENTAL

	<i>In thousands</i>
Naval Shipyard, Boston, Mass.: Reconstruct drydock (A. and E.)	\$1,072
Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Wash.: Drydock (A. and E.)	1,300
Harbor Defense Base, Norfolk, Va.: Barracks	300
Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, Calif.: Drydock (A. and E.)	1,300
Classified location: Harbor defense facilities	200

### AVIATION FACILITIES, CONTINENTAL

Naval air training stations:	
NAS, Glynco, Ga.: Turbojet engine test facility	170
NAAS, Kingsville, Tex.: Training building	592
NAS, Memphis, Tenn.: Turbojet engine test facility	170
NAAS, Whiting Field, Fla.: Land acquisition	13
NAS, Atlantic City, N. J.: Radar air traffic control center	371
NAAS, Brown Field, Calif.:	
Utilities	200
Galley and messhall	300
Barracks	278
NAS, Brunswick, Maine:	
Supply facilities	385
Structural fire facilities	113
Enlisted men's club	300
BOQ with mess	462
Aircraft parking area	2,478
Communication facilities and access road	1,157
NAAS, Edenton, N. C.: Aviation facilities	13,926
NAAS, El Centro, Calif.:	
Land acquisition for runway extension	1
Turbojet engine test facility	170
Niland-Blythe road	660

Projects included in the 1957 military construction authorization bill, H. R. 9893,  
not approved for funding in fiscal year 1957 by action of H. Rept. 2638 and H. R.  
12138, restoration to funding program requested—Continued

Naval air training stations—Continued		In thousands
NAF, Harvey Point, N. C.:		
Barge unloading facility	-----	\$197
Fuel storage	-----	400
Refueling facilities	-----	133
Boathouse	-----	240
Seadrome lighting	-----	150
Public works office and shop	-----	150
Nose hangar	-----	100
Utilities	-----	397
NAS, Jackson, Fla.: Radar air-traffic control center	-----	113
NAS, Key West, Fla.: Turbojet engine test facility	-----	170
NAS, Miramar, Calif.:		
Flight-path clearance	-----	5,000
Guided-missile facility	-----	800
NAS, Norfolk, Va.: Turbojet engine test facility	-----	170
NAS, North Island, San Diego, Calif.: Turbojet engine test facility	-----	170
NAS, Quonset Point, R. I.:		
Radar air-traffic control center	-----	304
Turbojet engine test facility	-----	170
NAS, Whidby Island, Wash.: Water-treatment plant	-----	149
Classified locations: Bombing targets	-----	1,030
Marine Corps air stations:		
MCAS, Beaufort, S. C.:		
Training tank	-----	592
Combat training tank	-----	200
Theater	-----	377
Turbojet engine test facility	-----	170
Support squadron operation compound	-----	197
Control squadron operation compound	-----	405
Fire station	-----	124
Fire and crash facility	-----	113
Cold-storage warehouse	-----	342
Fuel-handling facilities	-----	94
MCAS, Cherry Point, N. C.: Turbojet engine test facility	-----	170
MCAS, El Toro, Calif.:		
Water system modification	-----	180
Barracks	-----	1,601
Infirmery and dental clinic	-----	1,186
Tactical area development	-----	2,724
Training building	-----	722
Fire and crash facilities	-----	110
MCAS, Mojave, Calif.:		
Gas distribution system	-----	90
Sewage treatment plant	-----	206
Training building	-----	325
Water system expansion	-----	166
Electrical distribution system	-----	266
Steam plant and distribution system	-----	785
NAS, Patuxent River, Md.: Turbojet engine test facility	-----	170
NAMTC, Point Mugu, Calif.:		
Harbor facilities rehabilitation	-----	843
Submerged fuel transfer lines (4)	-----	80
Enlisted men's club	-----	128
Theater	-----	302
CPO Club	-----	159
Turbojet engine test facility	-----	170
NATTS, Trenton, N. J.: Altitude exhaust connection	-----	128

OVERSEAS AVIATION FACILITIES

Naval Air Station, Baarber's Point, Oahu, T. H.:		
Barracks	-----	598
Turbojet engine test facility	-----	272

*Projects included in the 1957 military construction authorization bill, H. R. 9893, not approved for funding in fiscal year 1957 by action of H. Rept. 2638 and H. R. 12138, restoration to funding program requested—Continued*

Naval air stations—Continued

	<i>In thousands</i>
NAS, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba:	
Telephone system	\$335
Barracks	723
Family housing: 8 senior, 17 junior, 89 enlisted men	2,085
Radio facilities	241
Utilities	592
Recreation building	358
MCAS, Kaneohe Bay, T. H.:	
Parachute loft	80
Turbojet engine test facility	272
Naval Station, Kodiak, Alaska: Access road	714
NAF, Port Lyautey, French Morocco: Turbojet engine test facility	221
Naval Station, Sangley Point, Philippine Islands: BOQ with mess	1,821
AEW No. 4, classified locations:	
Supply facilities	200
POL and distribution	253
Public works shops	69
Utilities	1,329
Communications facilities	69
NAS No. 3, AOA classified location:	
BOQ with mess	343
Fire station	56
Recreation facilities	212
Aviation supply warehouse	125
Aviation ordnance shops	53
Ammunition storage	195
Bore sighting range and compass rose	75
Family housing	2,103
Gatehouse and security building	5
Chapel and auditorium	226
Marine Corps facilities:	
MCSC, Albany, Ga.: NCO quarters and mess (open)	364
MCSC, Barstow, Calif.: Addition to preservation and packaging building	26
Marine Corps Base, Camp LeJeune, N. C.:	
Heating facilities	120
Support facilities	2,187
Service school facilities:	
Naval Training Center, Bainbridge, Md.: Recruit barracks and heating system (2d increment)	2,569
Ordnance facilities:	
NAD, Hingham, Mass.: Access road	78
Yards and Docks facilities: Replacement of damaged facilities	2,000
Total	69,945

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

*1956 and prior year projects previously approved for funding by the Congress not approved for funding in fiscal year 1957 by action of H. Rept. No. 2638 on H. R. 12138, restoration to funding program requested*

	<i>In thousands</i>
Fleet activities, Yokosuka, Japan: Family housing	\$6,540.8
NAAS, Chase Field, Tex.:	
Family housing	540
Fueling stations	284
NAS, Corpus Christie, Tex.: Fueling stations	269
NAS, Alameda, Calif.: Seadrome lighting	182
NAS, Brunswick, Maine: Composite approach lighting	82
NAS, Cecil Field, Fla.:	
Oxygen service and test building	137
High-intensity approach lighting	160

1956 and prior year projects previously approved for funding by the Congress not approved for funding in fiscal year 1957 by action of H. Rept. No. 2638 on H. R. 12138, restoration to funding program requested—Continued

	<i>In thousands</i>
NAAS, Edenton, N. C. : Family housing-----	\$1,421.5
NAS, Miramar, Calif. : High-intensity approach lighting-----	160
NAS, Moffett Field, Calif. : Composite approach lighting-----	160
NAS, Norfolk, Va. : Flight test and transfer building-----	750
NAS, Oceana, Va. : High-intensity approach lighting-----	160
NAS, Quonset, R. I. : Composite approach lighting-----	115
NAS, Whidbey Island, Wash. : Composite approach lighting-----	138
NCAS, Cherry Point, N. C. : Composite approach lighting-----	132
MCAS, El Toro, Calif. : Composite approach lighting-----	190
MCAS, Mojave, Calif. : Family housing-----	2,177.4
NAS, South Weymouth, Mass. : Radar test tower-----	270
Aviation, overseas :	
NAS, Atsugi, Japan : Family housing-----	1,514.8
Supply facilities, overseas :	
NSC, Pearl Harbor, T. H. : Drum reconditioning plant-----	172
Marine Corps facilities, overseas :	
Fleet Marine Force, Pacific : Camp facilities (3d increment)-----	6,000
Ordnance facilities, continental :	
Naval Ammunition Depot, Shumaker, Ark. : Barricaded transfer depot-----	765
Ordnance facilities, overseas :	
Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, T. H. :	
Yard, west Loch-----	515
Lualualei-----	450
Medical facilities, continental :	
NNMC, Bethesda, Md. : Armed Forces Medical Library (A. and E.)-----	350
Communications facilities, overseas :	
NRF, Kami Seya, Japan : Family housing-----	2,439.7
Yards and Docks facilities, continental :	
Various locations : Replacement of family housing-----	425.8
Total-----	26,501.0

Chairman HAYDEN. The committee will stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, at which time the committee will consider the Mutual Security appropriation.

(Whereupon at 5 p. m., Wednesday, July 11, 1956, the hearings were closed.)



## LIST OF WITNESSES

	Page
Abbey, Leonard B.....	171
Abramovitz, Max.....	719
Aderholdt, Lt. A. A.....	260
Allen, James C.....	41
Amstadt, J. M.....	19
Anderson, Arthur M.....	87
Anderson, Dr. Otis L.....	177
Anderson, Rex A.....	30
Arey, Hawthorne.....	87
Asher, Philip G.....	22
Auld, David V.....	303
Babe, John J.....	557
Barney, Brig. Gen. Keith R.....	589
Baron, Stuart T.....	1
Bartlett, Dr. Kenneth A.....	80
Bartlett, E. L.....	197
Barton, John C.....	30
Basnight, Arvin O.....	17
Batson, Douglas N.....	440
Bauer, Theodore J.....	171
Beach, Robert P.....	319
Beardsley, Rear Adm. G. F.....	616
Bennett, N. B.....	72
Bigum, Maj. Alfred C.....	513
Brown, Robert W.....	149
Brownell, Dr. S. M.....	149
Broyhill, Hon. Joel T.....	754
Brundage, Percival F.....	97
Bryant, Hon. Floyd S.....	575
Burton, Hon. Harold H.....	395
Brown, John C.....	395
Cake, Gilbert L.....	201
Cameron, D. E. A.....	112
Cannon, Julian F.....	201
Carper, Wallace.....	776
Chandler, Henry P.....	395
<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 15px; display: inline-block;"></div> .....	719
Christiansen, Milo F.....	252
Clemmer, Donald.....	287
Cogswell, Robert F.....	242
Colby, M. E.....	327
Colman, W. G.....	139
Corning, Dr. Hobart M.....	244
Crouch, Edward C.....	423, 437
Currie, John D.....	133
Daly, R. T.....	112
Davis, Hon. Chester R.....	589
Dawson, Donald.....	112
Dinneny, James J.....	557
Dodson, James E.....	557
Douglas, Hon. James H.....	650
Dryden, Dr. Hugh L.....	137
Dubrow, Morgan D.....	64
Dulles, Allen W.....	719

	Page
Edwards, A. M.	80
Eiseman, N. J.	133
Elbrick, C. Burke	437, 513
Estes, Thomas S.	112, 130, 423
Evans, G. E.	327
Ewing, Frank M.	753
Falck, Depue	67
Fentress, Carroll D.	60
Ferratt, George St. J.	187
Ferry, John M.	650
Finucane, Dr. Daniel L.	267
Fischelis, Robert P.	112, 129
Fisher, Roger	766
Fleming, Robert V.	530
Floete, Franklin G.	112, 540
Fogler, Hon. Raymond H.	616
Fredlund, R. R.	112
Gailey, Maj. Gen. C. K.	1
Garlock, Hon. Lyles	513, 650
Gatchell, F. B.	30
Givotovsky, V. T.	300
Golze, A. R.	72
Gotschall, John C.	1
Graham, Thomas H.	549
Grim, Wilbur H.	423
Haldeman, Dr. Jack C.	177
Hanson, Arthur	129
Harbison, Joseph S.	1
Harlow, Roy L.	163, 171, 177, 182, 185, 187
Harrington, Russell C.	213
Harrison, S. R.	301
Heath, Dr. Frederick C.	267
Henderson, Loy W.	423, 437
Herrington, William C.	412
Himmelbach, Dr. Clifton K.	182
Hopkins, Howard	380
Hume, Gray W.	213
Hutchison, Brig. Gen. C. R.	513, 589
Hutson, A. G.	300
Jack, Robert L.	213
Jones, Arnold R.	97
Jones, John Wesley	433
Jordan, Albert F.	240
Karrick, David B.	218
Keen, Paul	267
Kenworthy, Nelson A.	423
Kirkham, Mark M.	341
Kirks, Dr. Rowland F.	244
Lankford, Hon. Richard E.	750
Lawton, Maj. Gen. W. S.	513
Leavy, Charles W.	57
Lee, George F.	395
Lissek, William	301
Macomber, J. H., Jr.	112, 540
Macy, Loring K.	30
Marsh, John D.	129
Martin, Edward J.	41
Mason, Harold T.	549
Masur, Dr. Jack	182, 185
McCartney, Frank N.	327
McClellan, Harold C.	440
McConihe, F. Moran	112
McCoy, Horace B.	22

## INDEX

III

	Page
McHenry, Capt. Joseph H.	616
McKinney, Rear Adm. E. B.	616
McKone, Donald W.	149
Meade, Read Adm. R. H.	616
Medley, Max	540
Meyer, Mrs. Eugene	530
Mielke, Arthur E.	754
Moore, George T.	17, 19, 22, 30, 41
Moore, Maj. Gen. R. S.	513, 575
Murphy, Robert	433, 440
Murray, Maj. Robert V.	260
Myers, Lawrence	319
Nielsen, E. G.	72
Neilson, Oscar H.	17, 19, 22, 30, 41
Nolen, John	112
Noonan, Clifford	423
Nowell, W. E.	1
Nystrom, Harold C.	557
Oppenheimer, Jack	46
Orndorff, Roy L.	303
Orville, Howard T.	46
Palmer, Charles	423, 719
Palmer, W. I.	72
Paul, Norman S.	719
Phillips, Rear Adm. (Ret.) Neill	769
Poorman, Fred S.	423, 719
Popham, Dr. W. L.	365
Probst, Harley	423
Puntch, Guy W.	293
Richmond, Vice Adm. Alfred C.	193
Robbins, Laurence B.	549
Rothman, Stuart	557
Rowe, James H., Jr., Mrs.	530
Ruffner, B. W.	133
Ruttenberg, C. B.	139
Saunders, E. R.	719
Scheiderer, Lt. Comdr. E. D.	193
Schmidt, W. A.	112
Seckinger, Dr. Daniel L.	267
Sharpe, C. Melvin	244
Shaw, B. T.	341
Shaw, Dr. James R.	185
Shea, Gerard M.	293
Sheridan, E. J.	575
Shinkevin, Charles	423
Skeffington, J. P.	327
Sheppard, F. C.	139
Shotwell, J. L.	41
Smith, Marshall M.	30
Smith, R. M.	772
Smith, Rear Adm. H. P.	616
Spelman, H. J.	41
Stennis, Hon. John	106
Strawser, J. E.	112
Streibert, Theodore C.	440
Sunderlin, C. E.	139
Sutton, Millard H.	264
Symons, Dr. T. B.	753
Synon, George D.	193
Tavey, Harold C.	22
Turner, Lewis E.	650
Turpin, W. P.	540
Walsh, Frank J.	87

	Page
Waugh, Samuel C.....	87
Wohl, Henry.....	1
Woozley, Edward.....	67
Wheeler, Joseph C.....	319, 327, 341
White, L. K.....	719
Wilder, T. V.....	540
Ziernicki, L. A.....	395

# INDEX

	Page
Agriculture, Department of.....	319, 557
Animal disease laboratory facility.....	345
Construction and estimate.....	352-356
Ellender, Hon. Allen J., letter.....	356
Humphrey, Hon. Hubert H., letter.....	359
Shaw, B. T., statement of.....	345
Site, statements on.....	358-365
Commodity Stabilization Service.....	319
Sugar Act program.....	319
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.....	327
Crops insured.....	332
Evans, George E., statement of.....	329
Language proposed.....	328
Premiums received.....	340
Forest Service.....	380, 557
Bennett, Hon. Wallace F., statement of.....	557
Cache National Forest.....	387
Superior National Forest, land acquisition.....	380
Watkins, Hon. Arthur V., statement of.....	389
Industrial Use of Agricultural Products, Commission on.....	341
Agricultural Act of 1956, excerpt.....	342
Function of Commission.....	343
Khapra beetle infestation.....	365
Communications on subject.....	366
Cost of work.....	372, 376, 378
Mediterranean fruitfly.....	379
Army, civil functions of.....	1
Government and relief in occupied areas.....	1
Civil Affairs and Military Government, Office of.....	1
Ryukyu Islands, aid to.....	1
Administrative expenses.....	9, 15
Exchange of persons.....	8, 14
GARIOA funds, summary of.....	2
Schools, work under program for.....	4-9
Bureau of the Budget.....	97
Additional personnel.....	101
Armed services estimates, review of.....	102
Hoover Commission recommendations.....	102
Management review.....	97
Recruitment of personnel.....	106
Salaries and expenses.....	97
Commerce, Department of.....	17
Business and Defense Services Administration.....	22
Ferrous scrap resources, survey of.....	22
Scrap consumption, 1955.....	25
Civil Aeronautics Administration.....	17
Washington Airport additional.....	17
Coast and Geodetic Survey.....	17
Sesquicentennial celebration of.....	19
Language, need for.....	20
Foreign Commerce, Bureau of.....	30
Export control.....	30
Positions, additional.....	38
Smith, Marshall M., statement of.....	34
Public Roads, Bureau of.....	41
Jones Point Bridge.....	41
Public Law 534.....	44

	Page
Commission on Government Security.....	106
Breakdown of appropriation request.....	111
Industrial security.....	109
Salaries and expenses.....	106
Defense, Department of.....	513, 575
Air Force, Department of.....	650
Airbases deleted.....	682
Air defense command items.....	677
Air Force Academy.....	658, 675, 677, 678, 693, 694
Case, Hon. Francis, letter.....	690
Command distribution, Air Force.....	653
Construction program, summary tables.....	657, 659
Curtis, Hon. Carl T., letter.....	708
Dispersal program.....	692, 698
Family housing, 1957 appropriation, table.....	660, 712
Grand Forks Base.....	678
Hobbs, N. Mex., Air Base.....	681
Holloman Air Force Base.....	683
House committee reductions.....	685
Housing construction.....	676
Kerr, Hon. Robert S., letter.....	704
Land summary, 1957 appropriations, table.....	661
Lincoln, Nebr., Air Force Hospital.....	708
MATS, total appropriations for.....	679, 680
Mitchell Air Force Base, N. Dak.....	689, 696
Presque Isle, Maine, Air Base.....	684
Reductions, list of.....	700
Reprogramming requested.....	688
Restorations requested, list of.....	707
Richard Bong Base, Kansasville, Wis.....	695
Surplus commodity program.....	666, 714
Tinker Air Force Base, Okla.....	703
Unfinanced carryovers.....	686
White House Conference.....	711
Army, Department of.....	589
Army stock fund, procedure.....	598
Chavez, Hon. Dennis, letter from.....	606
Davis, Hon. Chester R., statement of.....	589
Ground-to-air missile program.....	615
Housing.....	603, 605, 606, 615
Korea, construction in, fiscal 1957.....	609
Military construction, Army, chart.....	596
Nuclear heating and powerplant.....	601, 615
Surplus commodity program.....	599, 601, 602
Technical training program.....	600
Yuma test station.....	597
Central Intelligence Agency.....	719
Accessibility of Langley site.....	741
Acreage, total.....	743
Addison, F. G., Jr.....	762
Broyhill, Hon. Joel T., statement of.....	754
Building, type of.....	742
Carper, Wallace, statement of.....	776
Classified operations.....	748
Construction, headquarters.....	719, 725
Community attitude, survey of.....	758
Cost estimates.....	744
District of Columbia site, objections to.....	739
Estimate.....	724
Ewing, Frank M., statement in opposition.....	753
Fisher, Roger, statement in opposition.....	766
Highways, funds for.....	738
Langley, Va., site.....	726
Lankford, Hon. Richard E., statement in opposition.....	750
National Capital Planning Commission et al., reports.....	720-737
Phillips, Rear Adm. (Ret.) Neill, statement in opposition.....	769

## Defense, Department of—Continued

Central Intelligence Agency—Continued	Page
Prince George County site	751
Sewage facilities	757
Smith, R. M., statement of	772
Symons, Dr. T. B., statement in opposition	753
Deutschemark negotiations	513
Belgian share	525
British and French, amounts agreed to	516, 524
Brucker, Hon. Wilber M., letter	528
Cost of program	521
E. D. C. treaty, failure of	514, 520
German contribution, amount of	514
German forces	515, 516
Military facilities, maintenance and operation	529
Payments, State Department policy	519, 521
United States troops, contribution to	517
Wilson, Hon. C. E., letter	526
Federal agencies, location of, policy on	762
Federal civilian employees, table	764
Military construction funding	575
Antiaircraft facilities	583
Bryant, Hon. Floyd S., statement of	575
FHA procedure	585
Houses, Government built	584, 586-589
Unobligated balances	587
Navy, Department of	616
Brunswick, Maine, Naval Air Station	647
Boston shipyard	646
Congressional action on construction, status of	619
Construction priority list, 1957	715
Forrestal-type carriers, drydock for	636
House action, clarification of	642
Military construction program	616
Naval Gun Factory, boiler repairs	639
Pensacola, Fla., Naval Air Station	644
Philadelphia shipyard	646
Portsmouth, N. H., hospital	638
Spain, construction program in	649
Unobligated balances	635
Wage rates, Portsmouth Naval Base	639
Wilson, Hon. C. E., letter	718
District of Columbia	218
Buildings and grounds	300
Capital outlay	227, 250, 290, 293, 297, 300, 303, 306
Census, school	248
Claims and suits	221
Corrections, Department of	287
Federal payment	218, 230
Fire Department	264
General administration	233
Highways, Department of	301
Karrick, Hon. David B., statement of	228
National Guard	308
Occupations and professions	242
Police, Metropolitan	260
Public Health, Department of	267
Public schools	244
Public Welfare, Department of	293
Public assistance grants	298
Recreation Department	252
Regulatory agencies	240
Revenues	223, 239
Sanitary engineering	303
Wage board employees, pay increases	313
District of Columbia Auditorium Commission	530
House action	533
Membership of Commissioner	532, 533

	Page
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	87
Federal Communications Commission.....	539
Language changes requested.....	540
Funds appropriated to the President.....	440
Information Agency, United States, allocation to.....	468, 477
Special international program, President's.....	440
Artistic and athletic presentations.....	447
Brussels fair.....	475
Communist cultural and trade fair activities.....	459, 472, 476, 485, 487
Files of State Department, excerpts from.....	494
Iceland, program in.....	484
Industrial exhibits, use of.....	480
International trade fair program.....	448-455, 457-468, 471
Lightner, E. Allen, Jr., statement of.....	492
McClellan, Harold C., statement of.....	491
Private industry participation.....	489
S. 3116, status of.....	471
Trade missions.....	456, 463
General Services Administration.....	112, 540
Acquisition of land, District of Columbia.....	119, 127
Additional court facilities.....	121, 130
American Pharmaceutical Association.....	129
Expenses, general supply fund.....	121, 130
General supply fund.....	122, 131
Lake Charles, La., property.....	126
National Association of Life Underwriters.....	129
Nome, Alaska, post office.....	124, 131, 542
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service.....	118
Payments in lieu of taxes.....	125
Properties, sale of.....	127
Repair and improvement, building outside District of Columbia.....	541
Johnston, Hon. Olin, letters.....	545, 547
Magnuson, Hon. Warren, letter to.....	545
State building, property near.....	128
Tin, acquisition of.....	540
Tribute to Administrator.....	112
Wage schedules, revised.....	116
Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of.....	149
Education, Office of.....	149
Executive Office of the President.....	149
Program, Committee on Education Beyond High School.....	150,
Authorization.....	152, 156
Emergency fund, President's.....	154, 159, 162
Employees.....	160
Funds, expenditure of, to date.....	161
Public Health service.....	154
Alaska mental health facilities.....	163
Construction program.....	177
Legislation.....	181
Communicable disease, control of.....	179
Foreign quarantine service.....	171
Harlow, R. L., statement of.....	163
Poliomyelitis, activities on.....	170
Salary increases.....	173
Salk vaccine, use of.....	169
States, assistance to.....	175
Tuberculosis.....	163
Uniforms and equipment allowance.....	163
Venereal disease, control of.....	166, 168
Disease and sanitation, control.....	163
Hospitals and medical care.....	177
Indian health activities.....	182
Pay costs, increased.....	185
Salaries and expenses.....	186
	187



## INDEX

XI

	Page
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	133
Public Housing Administration.....	133
Annual contributions.....	133
Information Agency, United States.....	468, 477, 505, 779
Appropriations, prior and current, table.....	779
Courts; disposition of equipment on.....	511
Radio facilities, acquisition and construction of.....	505
Interior, Department of the.....	57, 553
Bonneville Power Administration.....	64
Operation and maintenance.....	64
Fish and Wildlife Service.....	553
Kuchel, Hon. Thomas H., letter.....	553
Project proposed.....	554
Land management, Bureau of.....	67
Construction.....	67
Office of the Secretary.....	60
Office of Oil and Gas.....	60
Reclamation, Bureau of.....	72
Ainsworth project.....	79
Construction and rehabilitation.....	72
Solano Irrigation District.....	72
Southeastern Power Administration.....	57
Clark Hill power contract.....	59
Operation and maintenance.....	57
Virgin Islands Corporation.....	80
Operating losses.....	83
Revolving funds for loans.....	80
Judiciary, the.....	395
Administrative Office, United States Courts.....	395
Administrative office, value of.....	408
Nurse, need for registered.....	401
Space, request for additional.....	397
Fees of jurors and commissioners.....	410
Labor, Department of.....	557
Prevailing wages under Highway Act.....	557
Budgetary requirements, Highway Act of 1956.....	559, 566
State highway departments, consultation with.....	573
Wage rate enforcement, complaints on.....	571
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	137
Salaries and expenses.....	137
Wage board employee pay increases.....	137
National Monument Commission.....	537
Fund, purpose of.....	539
National Science Foundation.....	139
Akron laboratories, sale of.....	146
Synthetic rubber program.....	139
Unexpended balances.....	145
State, Department of.....	412, 776
Building, extension and remodeling of.....	423
Expenditures to date.....	429
Henderson, Loy W., statements of.....	427, 432
Fisheries Commission, International.....	412, 776
Herrington, William C., statement of.....	419
Humphrey, Hon. Hubert H., letter.....	422
Lampreys, problem of.....	421
Potter, Hon. Charles E., letter.....	776
International organizations, missions to.....	437
Vatican claims, payment of.....	433
Roosevelt message.....	435
Treasury Department.....	193, 549
Alaska, Territory of.....	197
Accounts, Bureau of.....	201
Disbursing work, increase in.....	204
Depositary receipts, statement on purchase of.....	212
New regulation, requirements of.....	204
Coast Guard, United States.....	193
Housing, report on.....	196

X

INDEX

	Page
Treasury Department—Continued	
Internal Revenue Service	218
Refunds, works involved in	217
Production and Defense Lending, Office of	549
Federal Facilities Corporation	549
Public Law 608, 84th Congress, 2d session	550
Weather Control, Advisory Committee on	46, 55, 777
Appeal letter	777
Orville, Howard T., statement of	54